

Notes of the Design Review Panel Meeting

Wednesday 1st March 2023
9:00am to 11:00am

MEETING TO DISCUSS METRONET DA FOR NEW STATIONS, STATION PRECINCTS AND PUBLIC REALM WITHIN THE ARMADALE LINE RAILWAY RESERVE

Attendance:

Council Officers: Robert Cruickshank, Manager Development Services
Emma Haak, Senior Planning Officer
Jack Hobbs, Place Planner

Design Review Committee Members: Annelise Safstrom (Urban Design)
David Barr (Architecture)
Robin Burnage (Landscape Architecture)

Applicant's Attendees: Frederick Sim (Public Transport Authority)
Renee Young (Element)
Ben Johnston (ALUA)
John-Paul Davies (Hassell)
Mimi Cho (Hassell)

Town Officer's Briefing:

- Town overall happy with aesthetic and design of parkland
- Still working through maintenance and management arrangements
- Relatively happy with Carlisle road layouts and design
- More work to be done on the Oats Street design – not clear on road geometry, materiality, etc.
- Lots of moving parts still to work through, especially given the number of stakeholders – PTA, ALUA, OMTID, Metronet, etc.
- Town's focus on public realm and street design
- Stations are PTA jurisdiction and being reviewed by State DRP
- Town expectation was for intersections under the viaduct and connecting road network to be upgraded to meet project vision – but ALUA/OMTID not delivering

Presentation/Applicant Comments:

- John-Paul and Mimi (principal landscape architects):
 - Multiple SDRP reviews
 - **Working Group with OGA:** on fortnightly basis to review design challenges/issues and addressing feedback from stakeholders
 - Separate to technical engagement with local governments – also fortnightly meetings

- Metronet Noongar Reference Group: working on developing a Place Strategy
- Overarching uniformity of stations along the line; whilst still celebrating the individual place elements – important design brief
- Engaged with Barry McGuire to design artwork and panels, walls, etc – embedding Noongar story telling elements
- Final colours not resolved
- “Stations within a park – not a park between stations”
- Key activation areas – interfaces with surrounding community around stations
- Quieter, calmer, interface with less activity in between the stations. Less disruption to residential areas
- Trying to keep carparking away from the parkland areas and closer to the stations
- Multiple entry points for both stations – to allow people to access the station from the corridor
- **Carlisle Station:** material and colour palettes choices to allow station to harmonise with residential character. But also want it to be recognisable.
- Can retrofit Carlisle to provide infrastructure upgrades (i.e. ticket gates, escalators, etc.)
- **Mint-Archer intersection:** Not part of project delivery, but opportunity for station forecourt to extend and impact pedestrian experience
- **Oats Street Station:** material palette and colours chosen to reflect form and character of Aqualife and TAFE. Trying to build connections with the TAFE campus to draw students into the space
- **Activation Strategy:** prepared in consultation with community – play spaces, engagement, celebrating spaces, multigenerational, etc.
- **Principal Sharded Path:** Kept PSP within road environment to keep high speed cyclists separate from pedestrians and parkland users. To be maintained on eastern side of corridor and reused as much as possible
- **Sustainability:** social, environmental, economical
- **Environment:** Tree loss inevitable – reinstating a significant number more trees than being removed
- **Water sensitivity:** redirect water from viaduct into rain shadow and shallow basins in parkland. Drainage design is still a work in process. Concepts lodged with DA; detailed design will resolve.
- **Public Art:** Still finalising interpretation and public art strategy
- **Materiality:** Different treatments to delineate pedestrian spaces and car spaces and shared spaces

Design Review Panel (DRP) Members Comments:

Stations + Station Precincts

Parkland/Landscaping

Public Realm/Streetscapes/Community

Art/Interpretation

Sustainability

- *Annelise Safstrom*
 - Station aesthetic could be a wayfinding/welcoming opportunity
 - Could light up the whole elevated line with LED lights to colour/theme the rail and stations
 - Could the drainage basins be more organic in their shape and form
 - Vision/Intention/Principles/Narrative documented in Design Report are all solid
 - DA is requiring an element of trust because there is a gap between the proposal and the Design Report
 - Large amount of work still required to translate vision into design
 - Escalators at Carlisle as part of Stage One – build for ultimate operational capacity
 - How much wind/rain/sun protection is being provided with the platform and roof designs as they are – angles of protection should be considered
 - No amenity around bus shelters for users
 - Identity of stations as viewed along the roads – could be articulated more through lighting of line/stations and/or roof structures
 - Aboriginal narrative is commendable but delivering that could be explored further through station material palettes, co-naming, artworks, landscaping, etc.
 - Planting species – could be refined to reflect signature character of Town of Vic Park
 - Carbon modelling would be useful information to have now. Lots of concrete being used – have other alternatives been explored (i.e. recycled materials) ?
 - Rutland/Oats Street intersection is poor – kept same kerb lines. Single lane design using original dual lane geometry. Too much hard surface. Could tighten it up.
 - Design Report flags great opportunities for the future – but how or will these be implemented once the project is delivered?
 - CPTED awareness is good
 - Fast-tracking project as need to achieve approvals and construction delivery by timeframes.
 - Consider comfort and appropriateness of seating (i.e. arm rests, backs, etc.)
 - Consider universal accessibility for all furniture, etc.
 - Character, identity and aesthetic level lighting should explore further and included in Lighting Strategy
 - Nature Play? Doesn't seem to be included. More informal nature play environments.
 - Planting choices have a colour focus: but could also consider catering for fauna habitats, extending flowering cycles, etc.

- Interpretation: unclear what's to come. Interesting to see what's to come.
 - Dog walking is a big part of the community – how can exploit that?
 - More active play courts given how popular they are ... explore this opportunity
 - No planting gap between car parking and station forecourt – consider landscape relief opportunities
 - Embed an artist in the design detail team to identify opportunities for brickwork patterning.
 - Possibly more social infrastructure around Harold Hawthorne (i.e. additional BBQs)
- *David Barr*
 - Landmark project. Substantial investment. But still significant and around for long time – so warrants design scrutiny
 - Good narrative and design story will help refocus the core vision/goals as the project progresses through concept to design to DA to detailed design to construction
 - Connection back to people is important
 - Working group is a good mechanism to address design comments from DRP
 - Recognise at macro level now, working towards micro level
 - 10 Design WA Principles as subheadings order comments
 1. **Context and character** – further resolution around detail of “Specific” elements (i.e. brickwork, pier treatment, landscape, etc.) will help create key identities for the stations. Are there any other local narratives to develop those Specific elements ?
 2. **Landscape quality** – deferred to Robin.
 3. **Built form and scale** – unified architectural elements – can see merit. How nuance to specific location is important – wind direction, sun direction. How this translates to affect the built form is important. Intersections of individual parts (i.e. glass, brickwork, roof) will need to be well considered to maintain intended simplicity of roof form.
 4. **Functionality and build quality** – sun, wind and shade comments of SRDP reiterated. Patron comfort levels need to be modelled.
 5. **Sustainability** – infrastructure for charging e-scooters, e-bikes. Repurpose and reuse parts being removed. Low VACs.
 6. **Amenity** - Material selection should consider more than just availability.
 7. **Legibility** – signage strategy coming along.
 8. **Safety** – brick projections are great (no potential climbing hazards). Tapered forms, soft edges, allowing permeability.
 9. **Community** – additional conversations around program underneath the train line. Maintenance of these spaces is important to consider – assets with long-term shelf line to reduce replacement frequency.
 10. **Aesthetics** – detail articulated to strengthen intent.
 - *Robin Burnage*

- Project responsibility to deal with traffic design of adjacent streets (i.e. calming, pedestrian infrastructure, etc.) – shouldn't be pushing onto local government
- Scale of public realm is huge. New parkland, removal of rail crossings – huge public benefit
- Commend on thorough documentation
- Appear to be trying to address SDRP comments
- POSITIVES:
 - Strong set of ideas
 - Hierarchy of ideas, narratives, etc.
 - Then feeding down into strategies
 - Like flowing continuous space. Gentle curving design in a linear space is the right response.
 - Potential for habitat creation for fauna with species selection
 - Making art part of the fabric of the place – not just singular pieces with no context
 - **Community art:** ephemeral art, blank canvases for local community, temporary art spaces for local community
 - **Sustainability:** State Government responsibility to lead and be exemplars for the rest of the industry. Encourage to keep sustainability front and centre to deliver great outcomes (i.e. zero carbon concrete)
 - Interpretation is looking interesting
 - Challenge for a project of this scale – how to get grand ideas and bring them down into the design
 - Ideas can get lost in translation - devil is in the detail
- FOR FURTHER CONSIDERATION:
 - Everything contained within corridor
 - Ideas talk about extending out into the adjacent suburbs
 - Project warrants inclusion of spaces outside corridor to achieve overall connection ideas (i.e. slow zones, traffic calming, key connectors and crossing points, legibility, etc).
 - Lots of linear movement along the corridor, but cross-connections seem weak or under-done. Potentially creates connection and safety issues. Avoid clashes with PSP by adding landing spaces, highlighting entry/arrival points.
 - **Traffic calming:** missed opportunity. Very engineered junctions. Loose linear nature of space. Could be landmark intersection to provide safe passage for pedestrians and achieve overarching goals for the project
 - **Lighting:** undercooked. Will be a night time destination. Lighting should reflect that. Lighting can help make it special – feature lighting, lighting as art. Note wanting to avoid light pollution and anti-social behaviour.
 - **Planting:** 30% canopy is good but could it be more? Set the benchmark as an exemplar project. Reduction of heat island effects. Use of non-native trees to reflect vernacular of the suburbs and create
 - **Rewilding:** fauna habitats – bird boxes, insect hotels, etc.
 - Bike shelters don't fit well within the rest of the landscape – bit utilitarian
 - Lots of bollards – poor visual outcome for project

- Linear footpath – through carpark at Oats Street. Could it be diverted and do something different with in.

Applicant Response to DRP Comments:

- Work with Town to come up with conditions which are workable, within project budgets and address comments
- Working Group strategies are useful to facilitate conversations around development of designs – constraints, opportunities, aspirations, etc.
- Often there is a tension in the design and is important to explore positives and negatives of different outcomes
- Don't disagree with comments about where opportunities lie to improve the project
- Working with client around what enhancements are possible
- Working on a proposal to improve art budget
- Already chosen some material and finishes to provide blank canvases for future art and/or lighting
- Working with Town for future impacts (i.e. Mint/Archer intersection)
- Sensitivity from resident feedback about noise impacts from playing courts. Trying to keep courts away from Vic Park area where housing is prominent and providing in locations with non-residential development.
- Trying not to duplicate spaces/opportunities within walkable catchments of the corridor
- Already trying to maximise informal nature play spaces
- Working with youth leader groups to maximise other active play spaces (climbing nets, etc.)

Closing Comments from Manager Development Services (Robert Cruickshank):

- Prepare consolidated document of DRP notes
- Like to think most comments already being addressed through the detailed design
- Pick up which comments can be accommodated in the DA conditions

Notes prepared by: Emma Haak, Senior Planning Officer