

TOWN OF COTTESLOE



DESIGN ADVISORY PANEL UNCONFIRMED MINUTES

MAYOR'S PARLOUR, COTTESLOE CIVIC CENTRE
109 BROOME STREET, COTTESLOE
5.00 PM, FRIDAY, 29 MARCH 2019

MAT HUMFREY
Chief Executive Officer

3 April 2019

This page has been intentionally left blank

1. DECLARATION OF MEETING OPENING / ANNOUNCEMENT OF VISITORS

The Chair declared the meeting open at 5.02pm and welcomed the Panel.

Cr Tucak acknowledged the meeting as being held on the traditional lands of the Nyoongar people near Mudurup Rocks, and acknowledged their ongoing culture and that the area is of great significance to them.

2. ATTENDANCE**Panel Members Present**

Cr Michael Tucak	Chair
James Atkinson	Deputy Member
Simon Rodrigues	Panel Member
Laurie Scanlan	Panel Member
Deon White	Panel Member
Trevor Saleeba	Panel Member
Craig Shepherd	Panel Member

Officers Present

Mat Humfrey	Chief Executive Officer
Ed Drewett	Coordinator, Statutory Planning
Jana Joubert	Coordinator, Strategic Planning
Liz Cartell	Administration Officer

Presenters

Samantha Thompson	Taylor Burrell Barnett
Scott Bradley	GKA Architects
Suzanne Eyles	Curtin Heritage Living
Tome Nunes	Total Project Management

Apologies

Dick Donaldson	Panel Member
Cr Lorraine Young	Elected Member
Cr Rob Thomas	Elected Member

Observers

None

3. DECLARATION OF INTERESTS

Cr Tucak declared an impartiality interest in that one of the Directors, the Executive, is known to him personally.

Craig Shepherd declared an impartiality interest in that Price Waterhouse Coopers is auditor of Curtin Care, and that he worked for Price Waterhouse Coopers.

4. ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION

Cr Tucak confirmed there would be two items for discussion: Wearne Hostel Redevelopment followed by the Design Review Guide and its implications for the Panel.

The meeting would begin with an introduction and overview of the pre Development Application (DA) proposal by Mr Drewett, followed by a presentation from the proponents and a Q & A session with the Panel.

Mr Scanlan entered the meeting at 5:07pm.

4.1 Wearne Hostel Redevelopment

- The proposal is made up of two components, one being 78 independent living units (ILUs) for the over 55s comprising 34 two bedroom units and 44 three bedroom units. The other comprising 129 residential aged care (RAC) rooms providing accommodation and nursing care for aged residents, including recreational, health, laundry and catering facilities. The total number of units is 207 and considered a substantial development for Cottesloe.
- There are a number of incidental uses including theatre, medical centre offering allied health services, a restaurant, café and exhibition centre/gallery offering an artist in residence. These will be made available for the residents and general public and be located along the ground floor on Marine Parade.
- Vehicle access to the development is predominately from Gibney Street into basement parking for staff, with visitor parking along Gibney Street.
- Applicants: Taylor Burrell Barnet Group. Architects: Grounds Kent Architects, SPH Architecture & Interior and Griffiths Architects.
- The site area is just over two hectares and the estimated cost of development approximately \$94,000,000.
- It will be a staged development with the units on the eastern side to be built first. Existing residents on Marine Parade will be relocated to the residential aged care unit while the further stages of work are undertaken.
- Site owners: The Town of Cottesloe, Town of Claremont, Town of Mosman Park and Shire of Peppermint Grove have a lease agreement to Curtin Heritage Living. The new lease is on the basis it will be redeveloped having regard to the approved masterplan. The DA will be approved by the Metro West Joint Development Assessment Panel (JDAP).

- The site is bounded by Warton Street, Gibney Street and Marine Parade.
- The current facility has 88 beds and associated facilities offering a high level of residential aged care. Marine Parade will become more independent living aged care units and the more intensive care will be located at the back of the development on the eastern side.
- Heritage considerations:
 - 40 Marine Parade is on the State Heritage and Town of Cottesloe's Heritage List under scheme provisions and under Category 1 of the Town's Municipal Inventory
 - The application will be referred to the State Heritage Office when received. Preliminary discussions have been undertaken
- Zoning is recognised as set aside for development and is listed as Zone C in the Town's Local Planning Scheme (LPS3). The site sits in predominately R30 medium density development to the north and south.
- Brief history of the process to date:
 - July 2017 - Provisional presentation given by Curtin Care
 - 2018 – Council endorsed the concept masterplan and authorised development of the Local Planning Policy (LPP) which were subsequently advertised
 - December 2018 - Council adopted the LPP and authorised the DA could be signed off by the CEO on the basis it was broadly in compliance with the masterplan
- Comparisons – in relation to the planning framework there are some small variations in relation to the adopted masterplan which is expected as the process evolves and looked at in more detail.
- Built form and scale:
 - Further to consultation with the Heritage Council more space has been allowed for around the heritage building and the overall mass of the residential units has been shortened
 - The central apartment block has been reorientated south to address the heritage building
 - The units along Gibney Street have been broken into three components as opposed to two larger forms, consistent with Design WA's principles
 - A dedicated residential vehicle access has been added
 - 20 visitor bays have been allocated for the ILUs (reduced from 25)
 - The heritage garden pathway has been revised in line with the State Heritage Office

- Gibney Street - predominantly three to four storeys tiered down the slope. Upper levels are articulated and set back in some sections. Parking is located in the basement
- Warton Street - up to five storeys for the residential aged care unit. Impact on Warton Street is less than 25% of the frontage and compliant with setbacks in terms of the adopted local planning policy
- Marine Parade – four storeys for over 55s ILUs. Ground floor houses a café and commercial uses. Upper levels are set back and articulated. At the top level a large gap opens up to balconies and a roof top pool and other amenity features for the residents, minimising the bulk from a streetscape point of view
- Street trees and large verges are being retained
- Movement and access – crossovers are kept to the minimum providing more of a linear approach. Gibney Street has approximately three crossovers, Warton Street two and Marine Parade none.
- Compliance with Local Planning Policy – this has been addressed by the applicants in detail and they aren't seeking any specific variations on the current planning policy.
- Compliance with Design WA (to be gazetted on 24th May 2019) – the ten design principles are considered to have been addressed by the applicants.

The Presiding Member opened the floor to questions from the Panel.

Q: What was the current situation with the Deaf School?

A: Three proponents currently are interested, two of which were also aged care providers.

Q: Did the boundary interface have any added any complexities? There wasn't much there at the moment but could be in future.

A: The application was considered compliant with setbacks from the eastern boundary and that future plans were unknown.

Q: Would the proposed development set a precedent for an increase in height in relation to the Deaf School?

A: It would have to have regard for the LPP and it had been suggested in current discussions there could be potential for the Curtin Care facilities to be shared with the Deaf School.

Q: Had variations been made since consultation was undertaken?

A: Minor variations had been identified from the masterplan originally adopted by Council. The current plans were consistent with the LPP which was subsequently

advertised. When it's formally lodged the application will be advertised. The Town would want to make sure the new owners of the Deaf School were familiar with the proposal and able to make comment.

The CEO advised that subsequent to the masterplan being endorsed and moving into the detailed design phase, an electrical transformer was located on site which proved costly to move. This impacted on a change in design from two to three buildings along the northern boundary on Gibney Street and as a result created some issues in terms of trying to link in with the existing heritage building. There are minor design variations that will probably need to be advertised when going through the DA process, but at this stage they don't materially impact the external appearance of the building and are considered to be more interior.

Q: Had there been any feedback on comparables in terms of converting something of this scale in aged care before?

A: Montgomery Hall in Mount Claremont was cited as an example of working with an existing heritage building.

Q: Was the building compliant with the LPP?

A: At this preliminary stage, the Council is happy with it and that Design WA's design principles have been taken into account. In terms of heights etc it was considered to tick all the boxes.

Q: Was there a theatre?

A: Yes, for residents use and located in the heritage building.

The reinstatement of the original pepper-pot roof to the belvedere was raised together with a discussion of the proposed scale.

The proponents were invited to enter the meeting at 5:27pm.

5. PRESENTATION

5.1 Scott Bradley of Grounds Kent Architects gave an overview of the proposal for the Wearne Hostel Redevelopment

- Site location
 - Considered very good position in terms of transit, connection to train and bus routes and adjoining the beach
- Base philosophy of the scheme's masterplan
 - To provide ILUs and RAC
 - To retain and open up the heritage building and gardens
 - To capitalise as much as possible on northern orientation

- To break the scheme down into a series of smaller building blocks in order to give transparency and light
- Primary factors
 - Retain the existing facility whilst building the new RAC facility. Stage 1A would address the rear portion of the site with the RAC backing up to the north eastern corner
 - The RAC section has been designed as two wings with a breezeway structure in between and 'households' to each side
 - Sixteen residents will be accommodated on each side on each floor of the RAC with a central courtyard area incorporated to let light back into the building
 - The heritage gardens will become a public use area
 - Marine Parade will be activated with a café and medical centre to create connection with broader community
 - The intention is to create a destination as opposed to a separated facility
- Built form and scale
 - Gibney Street has tiering and separation between the buildings. The site has 16 metre fall from east to west along Gibney Street
 - The design aesthetic has been to soften the built form and scale at pedestrian level by way of podium forms and planters. The verge has been retained to create pedestrian connection.
 - Palette consists of complimentary coastal colours and materials, beachy aesthetics and use of limestone
 - Apartments on Marine Parade have a 10 meter set back at the upper level to help break down the building's mass along the street
 - Car parking will be located underneath the building
 - 'Back of house' and the workings of the facility are located in the heart of the property as they will also service the apartments heading up to the north
 - There is an elevated ground plane to the RAC with a bridge link between the two households
 - First floor is a secure environment for dementia care patients with a protected courtyard garden located above
- Staging
 - Stage 1A - RAC and the first tranche of twenty ILUs
 - There will be 129 RAC rooms and 78 ILUs in total
- Landscaping
 - Use of coastal vegetation and passive style drainage swales
 - Verge improvement around the site

- Re-address the current car parking layout along Gibney Street to a perpendicular format dedicated to apartment visitors
- Retain trace of heritage driveway by way of gravel or similar
- Introduce a lookout position on the dunes for public use
- Celebrate the heritage building and significance of the Norfolk Island pines

Cr Tucak opened the floor to questions from the Panel.

Q: Was the garden to be opened up to both streets?

A: Yes, the intention is to pedestrianise the area and remove vehicular access. A series of pathways would be created back through with the possible inclusion of a small nature play area under the Moreton Bay fig trees, a lookout and use of the existing restored pavilion. Also by having commercial facilities along Marine Parade the hope is it will start to engage this space more.

Q: The proponent was asked to talk through interaction in relation to the conservation and heritage building, the upgrades and how that related to the staging.

A: As the existing facility is currently joined to the heritage building it would need to respond to the second stage because of the residents currently residing at the facility.

One of the other key issues is the location of a district transformer that has informed the staging process. The first twenty apartments are located to the east of the transformer so it doesn't need to be taken down while the facility is built. A new transformer will be built afterwards enabling the existing one to be decommissioned. In essence the entire facility needs to remain while the first stage is built. This has had a strong influence on the design and there is the ability to subdivide the second stage, depending on the market and how things are selling. There is the potential for three stages if needs be.

Q: It would be a shame to see the heritage element left until the last stage as it runs the risk that it doesn't get done at all.

A: The proponent advised that the heritage building is currently in use and very much part of the community facilities. It is considered integral to the use of the facility and will house non-invasive, passive uses. Mr Bradley outlined the proposed revisions, future uses and layout of the heritage building in more detail confirming the intention is to reinstate it to its original grandeur.

The proponent advised there's a portion of the building that isn't occupied at the moment and there has been some consideration as to how this space is activated. Discussions have been held with FORM about art directives for the scheme and the inclusion of potential studio space for an artist in residence program.

Q: If Stage 2 became a smaller component, would you foresee the upgrade of the heritage building being integral to part stage, even if Stage 2 was reduced down to a minimum component?

A: This has been discussed but not fully worked through. We are required to commit to what we are going to provide and when we are required to provide it. There isn't an option for us to duck out of doing the heritage component because we don't have anywhere else that we can put that communal amenity. We are bound by the act with it being a precedent to our lease.

Q: Was there any possibility and capacity for a connection between the site and the Deaf School?

A: The fall of the land and tyranny of the site has created difficulties they have worked hard to address. The proponent recapped on the benefits of the proposal, the potential activation created by community facilitates and the security of residents.

Q: Were the ILUs in effect just a luxury apartment development?

A: It is independent living. The accommodation requires at least one resident to be over the age of 55, and because of the nature of the tenure of the land it can't be strata titled.

Q: Were there any examples in Perth or state-wide of developments of a similar nature or scale?

A: Nothing that encapsulates all the elements and mixes the two.

Members of the Panel congratulated the proponents on a logical and sensitive resolution to the site and considered it a great outcome. It was agreed the overall scheme and landscaping concepts related well to Marine Parade as did the proposed verge treatment to all three sides of the site. However in terms of hiding the cars, it was considered a shame that the access for service vehicles was located so close to Marine Parade.

The Presiding Member thanked the proponents for their presentation who then left the meeting at 6:05pm. The Presiding Member invited any further comments and questions from the Panel.

Mr Drewett gave a summary recognising the amount of work that had gone into the preliminary proposal over the last two years and advised that the Town would be looking at getting the CEOs to sign the planning application, complete the formal assessment, prepare a Responsible Authority Report for JDAP and present to

Council. Notes of this meeting wouldn't be recorded in the RAR report, however there would be a further meeting at which comments of the Panel would be noted.

The Panel expressed concern that the heritage gardens would remain a hidden area and wouldn't get the amount of activation envisaged. It was suggested more effort may be required to encourage public use such as implementing a heritage trail, interpretive signage and the potential for engaging an artist in residence program in conjunction with FORM.

The CEO clarified the lease agreement in more detail, outlining there is a five year time frame for the development to be significantly underway after which the proponent would be required to activate a 50 year lease for the site.

He also confirmed the land tenure is conditional with one of the conditions being it can only be used for aged care. With regard to the heritage element and restoration of the heritage building, the proponent will be contractually obliged to carry this out as it is part of the lease agreement.

The Panel discussed traffic access at the corner of Gibney Street and Marine Parade in more detail. It is considered a potentially high traffic, high usage area. Service access to the café, loading areas and medical centre seem to clash with the resident parking access and don't appear to have been fully resolved at this stage.

The existing access points were reviewed. One suggestion was to remove the separation of the two carparks underneath to create a circular movement area and push the access to driveways further up the street and replan crossovers.

Details on whether there is sufficient room for truck turning circles and waste management collection still need to be ironed out and Mr Drewett will be seeking further comment from the Town's engineering department.

Mr Drewett gave a further precis outlining the pre-DA panel meeting was a new format and had been useful in terms of generating feedback. Subject to approval from the Panel, a copy of the minutes will be forwarded to the proponents to give them guidance prior to their DA submission.

The CEO confirmed that all four Councils will receive a copy of the meeting minutes and that each CEO will be required to sign the DA. This preliminary meeting is to give them reassurance that the proposal isn't totally unworkable or problematic.

The Presiding Member closed the item, thanked the Panel for their input and introduced Jana Joubert, Coordinator of Strategic Planning for the next item.

6. FURTHER ITEM FOR DISCUSSION

6.1 Amendments to Design Advisory Panel operation and structure as per Design Review Guide (DRG) (SPP7)

Ms Joubert drew the Panel's attention to the imminent gazettal of SPP7 which is linked to the DRG and provides governments with guidance and recommendations on how to operate DRG panels. A summary was provided outlining where the Panel currently does/doesn't comply with the regulations, most of which are relatively easy to implement.

Two main elements were highlighted, those being;

- In order to keep it independent there would be no Elected Member required. A Panel Chair (for example a Director of Development) would take the place of the current elected member plus the selection of up to five independent design experts
- Remuneration for panel members would be introduced.

Ms Joubert advised the guidelines are not mandatory however they are based on sound research and it is strongly recommended the Panel follows them. Most councils are now adopting the new format. The Panel was asked for feedback and whether there were any particular procedures they felt uncomfortable with.

The CEO left the meeting at 6:25pm and re-entered at 6:29pm.

Some members of the Panel expressed a preference to remain as is with an Elected Member Chair and no requirement for remuneration, suggesting the format currently in place already worked well. Other views considered that the more rigorous the process and closely aligned to the DRG the better. There was recognition of the need for a clear and transparent process and how that process is recorded. Alignment with policy was also considered to be of importance.

The Panel discussed merits, protocol and remuneration issues further.

Ms Joubert confirmed the procedure from here would be to revise the current policy and have Council endorse it, and advised she would be presenting to Council at the next Briefing Forum on Tuesday 2nd April.

7. NEXT MEETING

To be determined after lodgement of the Wearne Redevelopment DA.

8. MEETING CLOSURE

The Chair thanked the Panel for their attendance and declared the meeting closed at 6.40pm.