

**No. 34 Cleaver Street, West Perth**  
**Schedule of Submissions Following Advertising**  
**(Advertising period: 04.12.2017 – 17.12.2017)**

The tables below summarise the comments received during the advertising period of the proposal, together with the City's response to each comment.

<b>Comments Received in Support:</b>	<b>Officer Technical Comment:</b>
<p><u>Street Setbacks</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Proposed street setback is similar to existing street setbacks of neighbouring properties.</li> </ul>	All comments of support are noted.
<p><u>Lot Boundary Setbacks</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Majority of pre/post war dwellings have one lot boundary of less than 1.0m.</li> </ul>	All comments of support are noted.
<p><u>Walls Built on Boundary</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The boundary wall to the north is supported as it provides as opportunity to meet the R80 density of the land (for both the development site and future development of the submitter's land which directly adjoins the subject site).</li> <li>- The development, including front setbacks and boundary walls, will have no negative impact on the amenity of the submitters land, the street and our ability to gain access to winter sun.</li> </ul>	All comments of support are noted.
<p><u>Miscellaneous</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- If all land in the area was required to match in with the existing setbacks to old traditional houses it would be impossible to meet the R80 density targets unless flats were proposed, which is not a development outcome that should be promoted when good quality grouped dwellings provide a more diverse product in the area dominated by large single houses or traditional and unsightly walk up and high rise flats.</li> <li>- Precedent has already been set in the precinct for infill development of this nature. We support densification of the area which is only 1.7km radius from the Perth City Centre, and have no objection to this particular development.</li> </ul>	All comments of support are noted.

Comments Received in Objection:	Officer Technical Comment:
<p><u>Street Setbacks – Average Setback</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- This is a major departure [33% reduction] from the average setbacks of adjoining properties and is not accepted. The reduced front setback together with the 3 storey massing with no effective articulation, creates an unacceptable bulk facing Cleaver Street. It does not contribute in a positive manner to the existing streetscape. The existing 3 storey block of flats has an average of 6.5 metres.</li> <li>- The street setback is a significant departure from the deemed-to-comply. This leads to an overdevelopment of the site and will compromise the streetscape.</li> </ul>	<p><u>Street Setbacks – Average Setback</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The subject site is located along a portion of Cleaver Street which consists of a tree lined streetscape. This portion of Cleaver Street does not incorporate any Heritage Listed properties and is not currently contemplated to form part of a future Character Retention Area. It is considered that the proposal incorporates a range of materials and finishes to reinterpret the existing development style which currently exists in the streetscape. The proposal materials are considered to reduce the perception of building bulk on the streetscape.</li> <li>- The proposal is not considered to be an overdevelopment of the site, as all site areas have been met in accordance with Clause 5.1.1 of the Residential Design Codes (R-Codes).</li> </ul>
<p><u>Lot Boundary Setbacks:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The major departure [nearly 33 -50% reduction] from the required northern setbacks to adjoining property, is not accepted. The reduced side setback together with the 3 storey massing with no effective articulation creates an unacceptable bulk massing facing 36 Cleaver Street. It significantly reduces the existing amenity to 36 Cleaver Street.</li> <li>- The major departure [nearly 33 -50% reduction] from the required southern setbacks to adjoining property is not accepted. The reduced side setback together with the 3 storey massing with no effective articulation creates an unacceptable bulk massing facing</li> <li>- Unit 32, Unit 32A and Unit 32B Cleaver Street. It significantly reduces the amenity to Unit 32, Unit 32A and Unit 32B Cleaver Street.</li> <li>- The first and second level are in-line with one another which creates a bulky appearance and will result in a loss of amenity as well as lead to excessive overshadowing.</li> </ul>	<p><u>Lot Boundary Setbacks:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Although there are some departures from the deemed-to-comply provisions of the R-Codes relating to lot boundary setbacks, it is considered that there departures are capable of meeting the Design Principles of Clause 5.1.3 of the R-Codes.</li> <li>- The proposed development has included a range of materials and finishes throughout the elevations. Furthermore, the proposal has been broken up into two main buildings and has created central courtyards. This articulation and break in the façade is considered to significantly reduce the perception of building bulk onto the adjoining landowners.</li> <li>- The first and second floors of the proposed development do not include any major openings facing the southern or northern boundaries therefore, there will be no loss of privacy for the adjoining landowners.</li> </ul>

Comments Received in Objection:	Officer Technical Comment:
<p><u>Boundary Walls</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The length and height of the boundary walls will result in a loss of amenity for the adjoining landowners. Furthermore, this will detract from the amenity of the streetscape.</li> <li>- The proposed boundary walls will result in excessive overshadowing onto the adjoining properties.</li> <li>- Proposed length and height of wall results in excessive building mass.</li> <li>- Proposed parapet is strongly objected to due to excessive height.</li> </ul>	<p><u>Boundary Walls</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Following on from the community consultation period, the applicant has provided amended plans which significantly altered the design of the proposed development. The proposed wall on the northern boundary is considered to be well articulated with a number of materials to assist in the minimising of the impact on the surrounding landowners. The northern boundary wall for unit 1 is also broken up to provide for a terrace which is screened with timber panels and therefore, the boundary wall is not continuous and is considered to reduce the perception of building bulk and scale on the adjoining landowners.</li> </ul>
<p><u>Solar Access and Overshadowing</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- “The shadows caused by the new development is more than 50% to the individual units 32 and 32B Cleaver Street. These Units have their Northern winter sun to outdoor area and habitable rooms mostly obliterated.”</li> </ul>	<p><u>Solar Access and Overshadowing</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The proposal is compliant with the requirements of Clause 5.4.2 of the R-Codes.</li> </ul>
<p><u>Garages fronting the Primary Street</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Carports and garages should not be facing the primary street.</li> </ul>	<p><u>Garages fronting the Primary Street</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Although the proposal incorporates access from Cleaver Street, it is considered that the impact of the proposed garages and carports is minor. The proposed garages are setback 9.4 metres and 8.4 metres for units 1 and 3 respectively, from the primary street. The carports are open structures and have been designed to integrate with the remainder of the development. Therefore, it is considered that the proposed garages and carports will not have an adverse impact on the streetscape.</li> </ul>
General Comments Received:	Officer Technical Comment:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Concerned about the vibrations which will result throughout the construction of the development.</li> <li>- The proposed development drawings do not show the full impact of the new building on the surrounding existing massing to enable informed consultation and commentary.</li> <li>- The existing building are so lightly drawings and not in full section or elevation so as to be indiscernible.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Noted. A condition of development approval has been recommended which requires the submission a construction management plan. The construction management plan will ensure that the works undertaken as part of the development have minimal impact on the surrounding landowners.</li> <li>- It is considered that sufficient information was provided as part of the application.</li> </ul>

General Comments Received:	Officer Technical Comment:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Front elevation lacks detail of adjacent properties.</li><li>- Plans lack sufficient detail of adjacent properties and how they are impacted by proposed development.</li><li>- Submitter requests that a privacy screening to 1.6m high above balcony levels to the rear units face the right of way. Furthermore, the submitter requests that the rear unit bedroom windows to the right of way.</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- The proposed major openings and balconies comply with the visual privacy requirements of Clause 5.4.1 of the R-Codes and therefore, privacy screening is not required.</li></ul>

Note: Submissions are considered and assessed by issue rather than by individual submitter.