

Design Review Panel Report		
Project	Medical Precinct Urban Design Study and associated local planning policy	
Date	7 May 2020	
Time	11.00am to 12.30pm	
Location	Town of Cambridge (ToC), Administration Building, 1 Bold Park Drive FLOREAT WA 6014	
Design Reviewers	Marlaine Lavery (Chair)	Town of Cambridge
	Barbara Gdowski Philip Griffiths Gordana Nestic-Simic Tony Blackwell Malcolm Mackay	Design Review Panel (The Panel)
Consultant	Shannon O'Shea	Hames Sharley
Elected Members	Mayor Keri Shannon (via Zoom and from 12.10pm) Deputy Mayor Kate McKerracher Ian Everett Kate Barlow (via Zoom) Alaine Haddon-Casey (via Zoom)	
Planning Authority	Brett Cammell Kimberley Macphail	Town of Cambridge
Declarations	Nil	
Briefings		
ToC Project Team	N/A – 2 nd referral and the same / no new planning matters raised.	
Design Review		
Proposal	<p>Urban Design Study prepared to inform assessment of future local development plan for St John of God Healthcare Subiaco site, and to inform development controls for a local planning policy that applies to surrounding area.</p> <p>Medical Precinct Urban Design Study and draft local planning policy are for review by DRP, with participation for Elected Members.</p>	
Address	Various	
Key Issues / Recommendations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Methodology is sound and robust, but Study could be improved as per below comments - Study lacks clarity as to desired outcomes and could be simplified / edited to be more concise - Study fails to adequately address built form, therefore link to local planning policy provisions isn't strong 	
Chair Signature	Marlaine Lavery, Chair DRP	

Design Quality Evaluation

Urban Design Study

Overall comments

- The Methodology and process of the Study is generally sound and robust, but lacks the 'testing' component.
- The content is generally appropriate in regard to its observations on context and function, with the exception of built form (discussed below).
- Some issue with the clarity of the Study – outlined below.
- Further explanation is required regarding the precedent studies. That is, what are the lessons learnt - what worked and didn't work in each case, and how do they relate to this study.
- Further refinement in the presentation of the document is required - diagrams and plans need title, legends and/or clearer explanations.
- Some images seem to be used as graphics to simply fill space, have no explanation, and are not linked to text, which is a potential cause of unnecessary confusion.

Study content

- Study focusses on landscape, movement and activity which are all relevant, but the major missing component is built form – the most important component of the built environment.
- Doesn't adequately distinguish between the characters and roles of the adjacent street, especially the extent to which they are / should be urban or suburban.
- Doesn't identify the redevelopment / growth areas and logical staging for the SJOG site.
- Doesn't provide meaningful direction on the most obvious redevelopment opportunities – the western car parks and the vacant land on Cambridge St.
- An urban design study would normally include an assessment of building ages and conditions to identify redevelopment opportunities and constraints.
- Comparison of SJOG with integrated campus design is relevant for the SJOG site.
- E-W connection is an opportunity to establish a sequence of spaces and linkages.
- More needs to be said about a parking and access strategy.
- Some commentary is required about the impact of fencing, walls and hedging on street interaction.
- The concept that "landscaping becomes the glue" between different spaces and buildings is sound and supported by the Panel, but requires further articulation, eg no mention is made of therapeutic landscapes.
- Cross sections of Cambridge Street need further consideration in regard to setbacks and what their purpose is.

- Acknowledge that considerable work still needs to be undertaken by the landowner for the SJOG site – the study isn't intended to do this work, but it is intended to provide the foundation for the guidance offered by the LPP.
- Little mention is made and even less guidance provided with regard to aesthetics. A distinctive material palette and the use of colour(s) are clear opportunities which could to help create a distinctive sense of place for the campus precinct and also assist with wayfinding.

Elected Member comments

- 3 aspects most important to community – built form/height, traffic/parking, and dwelling density.
- Study needs to provide the evidence to enable a clearer link to height and built form controls of Policy.
- Study should reference West Leederville Activity Centre Plan.
- Estimation of built form can enable traffic assessment (though noted traffic assessment to be undertaken for LDP / SJOG site).
- History provided on Salvado Rd roundabout, considers the report too negative on this aspect.
- Considers current pedestrian access and usability of Salvado Rd is adequate.

Relationship of Study to local planning policy

- Study doesn't adequately link to the Policy with regard to the built form direction that the Policy needs to provide. The Study needs to provide the evidence base for the Policy.

Local planning policy

- Objectives don't address built form – need an objective that talks specifically to building height and mass and setback from streets in general and edges in particular.

o *Part 1 comments*

Pedestrian connectivity:

- Further consideration needs to reducing clashes between pedestrian and vehicle connectivity, as well as consideration of the implications of the different levels across the site and the impact upon universal access.

Public realm and street interaction:

- Land use provisions are a bit vague and may need to talk to preferred locations for particular uses - eg. Cambridge Street, street corners, and ground floors, etc.
- Is the Town happy to trade off streetscape for medical discretion?

Landscape:

- More guidance is required on landscaping for the public realm, both internally and externally, ie around the periphery of the site.

- Further consideration needs to be given as to how the current, 'courtyard-based typography' of most of the built form on site can be adapted to a more 'transparent' or permeable typography, whilst still maintaining the required levels of security and privacy.

Building scale:

- Include separate provisions for bulk, height and scale.
- 5 storeys on the northern side Cambridge seems ok, given the width of the street.
- The Medical Precinct should be considered in the context of differentiating centres along Cambridge Street, and greater height can be part of this differentiation.
- Height should be established by modelling – an evidence-based approach. Achieving solar access on the north-south axis will be critical for amenity and the viability of landscaped spaces.
- Urban design orthodoxy is to match heights either side of streets, though this doesn't necessarily need to be the case for the southern side of Cambridge Street in the Medical Precinct, especially in the context of a built form that is more of a campus approach punctuated, or permeated, by landscape.
- Also, the size of the SJOG site enables it to carry additional height set back from the streets.

Building setbacks:

- Add something that acknowledges that different streets, with different roles, may logically have different setbacks.
- Discourage car-parking within street setbacks.

Materials and architectural language:

- Not just about de-cluttering but also about avoiding too much homogeneity. Good design is a careful balance between variety and consistency.
- Reference the use of architectural elements to provide an appropriate scale and grain of building.

Vehicle access and parking:

- A parking and access strategy will need to be developed in future master planning. Direction should be provided on the location and legibility of parking (and access points), amenable pedestrian linkage and wayfinding.
- The Policy should talk to the treatment of parking (sleeving) in relation to the public realm to minimise visual impact.

○ *Part 2 comments*

- Urban design is about working from the outside in. Lesser heights to adjacent residential seems ok.
- Suggestion of heights in the frame area seem ok - 3 storeys to side streets, 5 storeys in the middle, 2 storeys at rear, maybe up to 3 storeys.
- 2m setback to Cambridge St is inadequate for tree planting or sufficient landscaping.

- Question what setbacks are trying to achieve – confusion between whether the Policy is trying to create urban or suburban street typologies (urban streets are defined by contiguous built form whereas suburban streets are defined by individual buildings separated by landscape (eg. West Perth, other than the Hay Street centre, is an example of a dense suburban place).
- Cambridge Street could be more urban, whilst McCourt St and Station St should be more suburban.
- Policy should propose a palette of wayfinding measures, including a very clear hierarchy of entrances, assuming multiple entrances are possible.

Design Review Progress			
	<i>Supported</i>	<i>Pending further attention</i>	<i>Not supported</i>
	DR 1	DR 2	DR 3
Principle 1 - Context & Character			
Principle 2 - Landscape Quality			
Principle 3 - Built form & Scale			
Principle 4 - Functionality & Build Quality			
Principle 5 – Sustainability			
Principle 6 – Amenity			
Principle 7 - Legibility			
Principle 8 - Safety			
Principle 9 - Community			
Principle 10 - Aesthetics	? *		
Previous DRP involvement:			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Onsite visit and analysis, 19 July 2019 • Workshop, 2 August 2019 • Review of draft Study, 28 November 2019 			

Design Review Panel Report		
Project	Medical Precinct Urban Design Study and associated local planning policy	
Date	8 October 2020	
Time	9:00am to 11:30am	
Location	Town of Cambridge (ToC), Administration Building, 1 Bold Park Drive FLOREAT WA 6014	
Design Reviewers	Brett Cammell (Chair)	Town of Cambridge
	Joe Chindarsi Philip Griffiths Gordana Nestic-Simic Tony Blackwell Malcolm Mackay	Design Review Panel (The Panel)
Consultant	Shannon O'Shea	Hames Sharley
Elected Members	Cr Ian Everett Cr Kate Barlow	Elected Members
Planning Authority	John Giorgi, JP Brett Cammell Simon Shub	Town of Cambridge (9:00-10:00)
Declarations	Nil	
Briefings		
ToC Project Team	N/A – 3 rd referral and the same / no new planning matters raised.	
Design Review		
Proposal	<p>Urban Design Study prepared to inform assessment of future local development plan for St John of God Healthcare Subiaco site, and to inform development controls for a local planning policy that applies to surrounding area.</p> <p>Medical Precinct Urban Design Study review by DRP, with participation for Elected Members.</p> <p>The associated local planning policy was not discussed at this meeting.</p>	
Address	Various	
Overall comments and recommendations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The overall document is comprehensive, complex and lengthy which presents difficulties in its interpretation and application. The document should be split or summarised (i.e. an executive summary) to ensure that the design guidelines are the focus with the remainder of the information to support the key elements. • The Study is a significant improvement on earlier versions with addition of design guidelines and modelling. It provides a good basis for the development of provisions in a Local Planning Policy. • The Boulevard treatment to Cambridge Street is a strong point for the Study. There is some question as to whether this 	

intervention is too late and how it can accommodate for the existing buildings with nil setback, though it was recognised that this was not a fatal flaw and should be pursued.

- The contextual analysis is much better than earlier versions and overall correctly identifies the precinct context.
- The potential for strengthening the local centre intersection of Cambridge St and Station St is a good outcome of the analysis. However, this section could be further improved with a building stock analysis to give an assessment of the likelihood of redevelopment.
- Landscaping is an important element that has the potential to draw together diverse and disparate built form. The Study provides some focus and attention in this area. However, this could be improved with further landscape detail such as tree species and consideration of street/surface treatment.
- The Study hasn't addressed all properties within the precinct, including those on Cambridge Street that are not SJOG owned and the south eastern section of the SJOG site (1-19 McCourt Street). The latter is very important as it relates to Subiaco and the termination of the Haydn Bunton Drive vista. Some analysis, including building envelopes and the desirable built form, should be included.
- Similarly, a building envelope should be shown on the western side of the SJOG Salvado Road entrance to achieve a more dynamic urban interface. It should direct and cater for future development that can activate the N-S pedestrian link at the entry. Development in front of the long un-activated decked car park should be designed to reduce the facility's streetscape impact.
- Vistas into the Study area and SJOG site (southern portion of Station Street & corner of Roydhouse Street) are important and could be better addressed in the Study.
- Solar diagrams should consider a target for sunlight (e.g. 5 hours of sunlight).
- Further consideration of what options may unfold for the redevelopment of McCourt Street is required, eg with, or without amalgamation of lots. Also, this analysis needs to consider the inherently disparate nature of the two sides of this street. Privacy and the impact of over-shadowing also require consideration.
- Whilst the currently prescribed heights and setbacks for areas surrounding the site respond to current social expectations and reflect a sensitivity to the need for human scale, balanced against commercial expectations, they are likely to be problematic at the implementation stage primarily due to lot sizes and likely to result in poor architectural design outcomes (described as the 'wedding cake effect'). The following heights are recommended:
 - i. Generally a 4 storey height limit with 5th storey setback is appropriate for the street frontages surrounding the site.
 - ii. Building bulk should be staggered from the rear laneways to reduce impact on adjoining properties. The draft setback provisions are ok in this regard – 2 storeys at laneway, and stepped back from there.

