

**Attachment 7 – Design Review Panel comments - Nos 467-493
(Lots 1-4) Albany Highway, Victoria Park - Development Application
5.2020.590.1 for New Commercial Building**

DESIGN REVIEW PANEL (DRP)

RECOMMENDATION ON PLANNING PROPOSAL

Application type:	Development Application
Proposed development:	New Commercial Building
Address:	No.467, 479, 487 & 493 Albany Highway, Victoria Park

Please refer to the **attached** memo which describes the proposal, a table outlining the proposal's compliance with the applicable planning framework and the Town's draft recommendation on the proposal (including draft conditions / reasons for refusal).

Following review of the memo, please briefly comment on the following:

1. What are the strengths of the design?

- Inclusion of the street trees.
- The contextual references to the locality through brickwork, arched forms, recessed doorways and low walls under the shopfront windows.
- Continuity of canopy coverage.
- Parking located away from the street.
- Café on prominent corner.
- Corner window at ROW entry.
- Photo voltaic (solar power) system on roof.
- The use of brickwork and the curved element is a nod to the arch and Corner accented with extra height.
- Streetscape engagement – show on plans

2. What are the weaknesses of the design?

- Single-storey development has limited visual presence. This, plus loss of mixed use (as per previous JDAP approvals) from development, means that it does not contribute to the urbanisation of the Albany Highway corridor and associated flow on benefits. But, "It is what it is" and this is market forces at play.
- Missing the grain, of detail, tiling, trims at the pedestrian level.
- Limited enhancement of the street verge - could have included more landscaping in the street in consultation with the ToVP.
- No consideration of al-fresco activity in the street.
- Better integration of signage and more detail.
- Segmented window in curved wall – inelegant/mismatching styling.
- Method of screening rooftop AC units not shown.
- Car-parking issue is noted but is a planning matter not a design matter.



- Signage located on the corner upper level brick becomes very prominent. Signed on canopy would be preferable.
- Tenancy geometries seem unnecessarily complex. These could be rationalised and can these be simplified. Particularly tenancies 1 and 2 are awkward and inefficient. This would seem to be easily rectified by relocating the loading dock further to the NW.
- Back of house access from Tenancy 1 and 2 is via a loading dock. Is loading dock used after hours? Management details needed.
- One or two of the earlier arch option concepts were more appealing. Corner arch that turns a corner and functions as a bent beam/lintel is contemporary in character. This in itself is not intrinsically bad, but loses relevance to/sense of historic streetscape character.
- Floor levels of tenancies 1 and 2 are below the entrance level and hence could have some drainage issues.
- Some concern was raised with regard to the adequacy in relation to the swept path of service vehicles / trucks accessing the loading dock.

3. Any specific items you wish to be revised or addressed through conditions?

- Ensure universal access to each of the ground tenancies.
- Universal Access Bay required at rear of property – this could possibly be achieved by converting existing Bay 9 and utilising the pedestrian path as part of this space.
- Window(s) onto, and preferably looking down, the lane from Tenancy 4.
- Cut-outs in awning/canopy to accommodate trees (to be coordinated with the Town undertaking the tree planting). Notches to possibly reflect the arch in plan.
- Inclusion of landscape in triangle between bays 12 and 13.
- Canopy thickness to be tested to ensure it can accommodate box gutters and drainage.

4. Any other comments?

- The proposal is a row of shops. It looks like a row of shops. It will do its job as a row of shops.
- White render could appear rather flat with the simple design? Canopy, fascia and soffit.
- Indian Supermarket adjacent (with the exception of excessive window signage) is an example of streetscape character and grain that can/should be worked into elevation design.
- Structure for parking to be considered – large spans (particularly span from Bin store to bay #04 column) and no columns with a thin structure. Mightn't be viable
- Parking is a planning/council matter.

Possible Conditions Discussion Points

- Laneway surveillance
- Universal access 1+2
- Universal car bay



- Colour / Conditions
- Signage – detailing and integration into the building

RECOMMENDATION:

Support

Names:

Malcolm Mackay & David Barr & Tony Blackwell

Date:

11/2/21