

## Notes of the Design Review Panel Meeting

Online (Microsoft Teams) Meeting  
Thursday 1 September 2022

### Meeting to Discuss:

**Belmont Park Racecourse Precinct A Local Development Plan  
at No. 3 Graham Farmer Freeway (Lot 102 PL72026) (Town ref: 5.2021.436.1)**

### Attendance:

Council Officers: Robert Cruickshank, Manager Development Services  
Kelly Vilkson, A/Coordinator Urban Planning

Design Review Panel  
Members: Chris Maher (Architecture)  
Malcolm Mackay (Urban design)  
Tony Blackwell (Landscape architecture)  
Rob Mulcahy (Building services)

Applicant's Attendees: Tom Willday (Bridge42)  
Maxwell Watkins (Bridge42)  
Alison Healey (Element)  
Matt Raymond (Element)

---

### **Purpose of the meeting**

To consider the draft amended LDP documentation received on 22 July 2022 in relation to comments provided at the DRP meeting held on 31 March 2022.

---

### **Applicant presentation:**

The Applicant group provided a brief overview of recent applications, meetings with other external authorities (such as the DBCA to discuss the foreshore management plan) and engagement of architects. In addition, the Applicant presented a short 3D imagery fly through depicting different building typologies and presented the proposed foreshore treatments.

---

---

## **DRP Member Comments:**

### *General –*

- The overall improvement to the LDP over the past year, including the consolidated format of the amended LDP (Part 1) is acknowledged. It is considered that the amended LDP now meets the intent for this planning mechanism.
- Appendices details need to be updated to align with current version of the LDP.
- Recommend inclusion of cross-sections from the river to the racecourse to demonstrate how the development responds to ground level changes.
- Culture acknowledgement in the LDP is tokenistic. The reference to cultural place interpretation in the public art strategy should be referenced in the LDP.
- State Architect – please clarify how this applies to the development applications.
- The Objections should be further refined. For example, the statement that the development will attract a high level of amenity should be modified to state weather the development will provide a high level of amenity. In addition, an objective for ESD should be included.

### *Parking Management -*

- Does not agree with the LDP statement that this area is not a destination. Adequate parking needs to be provided for visitors.

### *West Park –*

- Foreshore Link - Landscaping only on one side of the road, however, landscaping should be provided on both sides to ensure appropriate setback of dwellings on the Midshore Lots.
- Rooftop terraces – ensure that the provisions do not preclude the opportunity to provide rooftop terraces.
- West Park end lots – recommend including the irregular geometry of lots into the public realm rather than the lots.

### *North Park –*

- North Park Racecourse Lots - Recommend including provisions on page 9 to control provision of visual gaps to provide a visual link between the green fingers and the racecourse.
- Rooftop terraces – ensure that the provisions do not preclude the opportunity to provide rooftop terraces.

### *Racecourse Lots (Apartments) –*

- In relation to the height of the podiums and overall building height clause 8.4 states that modulation is encouraged. The LDP requires provisions to guide how modulation will be controlled and provide clarification to prospective purchasers regarding the allowed heights.
- Modulation of the overall height should be clarified with consideration of overshadowing over the racecourse.
- LDP needs provisions regarding the articulation of podiums to the street.

- Specific provisions are required to explain the meaning of the statement 'Primary façade continues around to the laneway for a min. 20% of the lot depth' (clause 8.4 item 10).
- Plan 1 shows a green space between Lots F and G but there is no corresponding explanation regarding the use of this space.

*Environmental Sustainable Design (ESD) -*

- Provisions relating to Green Star design are vague and need to be clarified to differentiate between development types.
- Provisions can be more prescriptive for the bulk residential development.
- Rating tools are more applicable to apartments.

*Wind -*

- Requirements need to be further reviewed and clarified in the LDP rather than at Development Application stage. It is recommended that an analysis of the cumulative effect of the towers be undertaken at the LDP stage.

*Movement*

- Page 5 cross-sections – Narrow roads may potentially impact on the ability to install service infrastructure and trees. Are these cross-sections achievable?

*Public Open Space (POS) -*

- Midshore Lots (clause 8.2) - Linear Park landscaping imagery does not appear to provide for the tree planting due to the width of the footpath. Recommend inclusion of provisions/plans outlining the intended landscaping.
- Racecourse Lots Apartments (clause 8.4) Open Space – It is understood that the WAPC has requested that the LDP does not vary the required provision of 10% of POS, however, the DRP members are not concerned about the reduced provision of POS.
- North Park PSP and foreshore landscaping – PSP is rigid and it is recommended that the alignment could be further modulated with consideration of the retention/rehabilitation of the existing coastal saltmarsh.