
Appendix 11: Response to State Design Review Panel Assessment

DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING, LANDS AND HERITAGE	
DATE	FILE
08-Dec-2020	SDAU-010-20

120 Marine Parade (Lot 500), Cottesloe

Responses to DRP2 from 22 October 2020

DRP COMMENTS	RESPONSE
<p>Principle 1: CONTEXT & CHARACTER</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Panel remains concerned that the proposed built form envelope – height in particular – will adversely impact the amenity of neighbouring properties. It will also interrupt ocean views from the Cottesloe Civic Centre, which is an important communal asset on the State Heritage Inventory and local government Municipal Inventory, due to its architecture and civic/social history. The proposed height should be reconsidered due to these negative impacts. 	<p>Solar and daylight access studies were explored which are demonstrated on pages 34 and 35 of the Architectural Report to identify the implications on neighbouring amenities. These solar studies investigate the overshadowing during the Winter Solstice (June 21st between 9am-3pm) which only affect Lots 350 and 20. Approximately 0-1 hours of direct sunlight is compromised at the northern outdoor area of Lot 20 between 2-3pm. Lot 350 outdoor amenities that are affected by the overshadowing of the 120 Marine Parade proposal, consist of a bin area, driveway, a non-accessible forecourt, unit porch and a courtyard enclosed by a non-permeable boundary wall approx. 1972mm in height. The proposal affects the areas that would otherwise receive direct sunlight for 0-1 hours during the winter solstice. This is a minor impact on the neighbouring amenity areas.</p> <p>On page 58 of the Architectural Report, a video simulation was created depicting the future build-out of the current Cottesloe Town Planning Scheme from the view point of the Civic Centre (Videos 1 and 2). In comparison, Videos 3 & 4 depict the integration of the proposal with the immediate neighbouring properties of the proposal (Lots 1 & 3) massed at the same height. With the existing trees, minor impacts of the Civic Centre's views are affected. Please refer to Appendix 12 – Heritage Report for further information.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The site is relatively small for a multi-residential development. Given the similar size of adjacent lots, and the boundary-to-boundary approach, the Panel remains concerned this will set an undesirable and 	<p>The current Cottesloe TPS has detailed Lots 1, 500 and 3 as one massing. In the instance the neighbouring properties were to be developed at the same height as the proposal, pages 55 and 57 of the architecture report demonstrate the</p>

<p>inappropriate precedent for this portion of Marine Parade. As noted in DR1, the Panel is concerned that if the height proposed was replicated on each of these lots, the broader impact would be substantial, detrimental and would significantly alter the character of the area.</p>	<p>developed Lots in context of the Cottesloe TPS. As previously noted, Videos 3 & 4 on page 58 demonstrate 9 storeys on Lots 1, 3 and 500 Marine Parade. We believe this result would not have a detrimental impact or significant impact on the character of the area, but rather be a successful adjustment to the TPS, improving the quality of the character of Marine Parade and creating a dynamic street elevation and appropriate response to the Cottesloe Foreshore development.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The character of Cottesloe is defined by typically lower scale building typologies, with taller buildings to the crest of the hill, providing equitable access to views and daylight. Its predominantly two-storey architectural form, typically 7m, has been respected by new development in Overton Gardens adjacent to the Civic Centre. Increased heights along other lots on Marine Parade may be appropriate where no adverse impact to significant view corridors will result. The subject site is not considered one of those exceptions. 	<p>As clearly demonstrated in the Civic Centre View Analysis (pages 10-21), videos 1-4 (page 58) in the Architectural Report, any potential of visual impact of the proposal from the Civic Centre is interrupted by the existing trees and existing adjacent built form (15 Overton Gardens). Glimpses of the proposal from the Civic Centre has minor impact of these views in comparison to 5 Overton Gardens. Please refer to Appendix 12 – Heritage Report for further information.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> View corridors from the site, locally significant landmarks (particularly the Civic Centre) and through the local area have been tested by the proponent team, however serve to demonstrate the adverse impacts anticipated by the Panel. 	<p>The additional video simulations (videos 1-4 on page 58) as well as the addition of Appendix 12 – Heritage Report prepared by Griffiths Architects further support our findings.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The comparison of the Scarborough beachfront as a precedent to support the proposed increased height was not deemed relevant by the Panel. Cottesloe's heritage value, maisonettes and traditionally lower scale-built form differentiate it from the Scarborough precinct. 	<p>The proposal does not aim to mimic the Scarborough beachfront, however it may be noted that the natural progression of precincts in Perth have increased in density with population growth and local planning scheme developments. Cottesloe has developed the Foreshore Masterplan but has not updated the TPS.</p>
<p>Principle 2: LANDSCAPE QUALITY</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Panel noted that if rear access is provided in the future, and deep soil area removed in accordance with the Town of Cottesloe's LPS3, this may affect the deep soil area calculations and viability of enduring landscape amenity. 	<p>As demonstrated in Appendix 5 – Landscape Report, should the landscaping along the eastern boundary at ground level be removed, the Deep Soil Area requirements will still be achieved.</p>
	<p>Please refer to Appendix 5 – Landscape Report Table 03: Tree Pot Size for details.</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Panel seeks confirmation of the soil depths to be provided to support healthy tree growth. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Panel noted concern for access and maintenance of proposed above ground planter boxes; some appear serviceable only via windows which presents a safety issue. 	The windows that access the planter boxes are high windows sitting 1000mm above the FFL.
Principle 3: BUILT FORM & SCALE	Please Refer to Planning Solutions Report for this response.
Principle 4: FUNCTIONALITY & BUILD QUALITY	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Panel noted and supported efforts to address the future functionality concerns for the bedroom 2 windows; resolving the carpark layout conflicts; providing services and amenities to the ground floor café tenancy and integrating services into the roofscape design. 	No response required.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Further details of traffic management solutions are sought, should the car lift malfunction for visitors and residents. 	Please refer to Appendix 6 – Traffic Management Plan produced by Cardno
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed vehicle access reduces the quantum of active streetscape and has the potential to compromise pedestrian safety, but the Panel considers the approach reasonable in this singular instance, given that future rear access across the three neighbouring properties – to serve this one property – is unlikely. However, the Panel noted caution in replicating this approach elsewhere along Marine Parade. 	For further information regarding pedestrian safety and circulation hierarchy please refer to pages 44-47 of the Architectural report.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Panel commended the functionality, generosity, and high build quality of the apartments. 	No response required.
Principle 5: SUSTAINABILITY	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Panel noted the intent to exceed the Green Star rating required under the NCC, and for each apartment to achieve a NatHERS rating. Confirmation of the target ratings is sought. 	Please refer to Appendix 9 - Sustainability Thermal Review produced by CADDs Group Energy + Sustainability for further details.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some information was provided, confirming intent to install photovoltaics, smart metering, insulation, solar hot water, sensor lighting and clotheslines. Confirm whether any additional sustainability considerations are being pursued such as; sustainable construction materials, water management and conservation, and good waste management/recycling practices. 	<p>Please refer to Appendix 9 - Sustainability Thermal Review produced by CADDs Group Energy + Sustainability for further details as well as pages 39-41 of the Architectural Report.</p>
<p>Principle 6: AMENITY</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Panel noted and supported the reduced apartment depths in response to DR1 commentary. 	<p>No response required.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Panel noted and supported the increased rear setback to single residential properties on R60 lots to the east. However, the amended design proposes balconies at the second and third floor facing the R60 lots which may impact on visual privacy. The proponent is encouraged to demonstrate how this may be mitigated. 	<p>Lot 36 (3A Napier St) has no openings on the 2 storey boundary wall and is not at risk of privacy concerns. Unit 4 on Level 2 of the proposed development is screened with privacy louvres angled away from outdoor amenity spaces of Lot 41 (5A Overton Gardens) and includes a 1000mm deep planter box to the Bedroom 2 to ameliorate any further privacy concerns. Please refer to drawing A1-07 for plan details and pages 36-37 of the Architectural report for further information.</p>
<p>Principle 7: LEGIBILITY</p>	<p>No response required.</p>
<p>Principle 8: SAFETY</p>	
<p>Generous passive surveillance of the Marine Parade public realm from the apartments and café was again, commended.</p>	<p>No response required.</p>
<p>The Panel reiterated the importance of ameliorating potential traffic safety issues should multiple vehicles be waiting to access the car lift. How will pedestrian safety be protected? The Panel notes the applicant's intent is to address this in the traffic management plan.</p>	<p>Please refer to Appendix 6 – Traffic Management Plan produced by Cardno and pages 44-47 of the Architectural Report.</p>
<p>Principle 9: COMMUNITY</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Panel commended the addition of a single bedroom dwelling (1A) with a potential dual key access arrangement, providing diversity and adaptability. 	<p>No response required.</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Panel did not support the view/use impacts on the Civic Centre. 	Please refer to Appendix 12 – Heritage Report and page 58 (Videos 1-4) of the Architectural Report.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Panel did not support the extent of morning overshadowing of the Marine Parade foreshore, negatively impacting on the amenity of this valued community space. 	Please refer to pages 59-70 of the Architectural Report and page 71 (Videos 5-8) which detail the implications of the proposal’s overshadowing. As per the SDAU guidelines, overshadowing has been explored on June 21, August 22, September 22 and October 22 between 10-2pm. The overshadowing to the Cottesloe Foreshore is only noticeable for a short period of time from 10am on June 21 and 10am on September 22. This is considered a minor impact and does not compromise the amenity.
Principle 10: AESTHETICS	No response required.