

**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>Applicant 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>	Noted and Agreed
<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>	Noted and Agreed

<b>Comments Received in Objection:</b>	<b>Applicant Comment:</b>
<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>Not accurate and it would be incongruous to include this calculation as the sole determination for setbacks for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The three storey flats have a canopy at nil setbacks and the same setback to all three levels.</li> <li>• To use the three storey flats as an example of a good development outcome with appropriate setbacks is undesirable.</li> <li>• Setback figures used do not factor in the full height front fence and carport at 40 Cleaver or the front entry structure at the flats</li> <li>• The houses to north of the site on the westside of Cleaver all have average setbacks of 2-0, plus more full height front fences</li> <li>• No. 26 front setback is for car parking which is undesirable</li> <li>• 3 sites immediately adjoining the site in the north are large single houses where redevelopment would be expected and is actually encouraged by the R80 density.</li> </ul> <p>We do not agree, average of setbacks is 3.12m when definition of street setback in R Codes is used (which Policy 7.1.1 requires), the development</p>

Comments Received in Objection:	Applicant Comment:
<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 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>- 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>therefore complies</p> <p>The is a misleading statement as the neighbour at No. 36 has provided support in writing to the boundary wall and development generally. This comment should be considered invalid as this person does not have a role to “accept” the wall and the submission is not from the person who’s boundary the wall is to be built upon.</p> <p>It is also incorrect to suggest there is no articulation; the wall includes two small potions only, being a 8.245m and 4.525m portion of wall, which equals a total of 12.77 along a 42.728m boundary (29.87%) and is broken up by a terrace and balcony area.</p> <p>We contend that this comment is incorrect for the following reasons;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is significant articulation along all walls through a mixture of breaks in the building for a light well and terrace (House 3) and at least 3 differing materials to the rear building, as well as windows and timber slat openings to the balcony;</li> <li>• No. 32 is setback approximately 1m from the north boundary, and the rear building at 32B currently has a garage roof, a blank wall with minor openings and a balcony with a large blank screen, with no articulation along our boundary.</li> <li>• No. 32 A is on the south side of the block and as 32 is in the way could not possibly be claimed to be neatviley impacted.</li> </ul> <p>Which wall does this refer to, all walls are less than 8.245m 4.25m and 12.31m respectively in a 3 storey height limit area and should not be considered to be excessive.</p> <p>The proposed development complies with the overall three storey building height and the neighbour at 36 Cleaver has provided support of our proposal.</p>

Comments Received in Objection:	Applicant Comment:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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>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> </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>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>The buildings are designed as townhouses in an R80 area where the need for access to the rear gives rise to a 5.668m lot width and it being completed reasonable to build to the internal boundary as per clause 5.1.3 C3.2 (ii), a stairwell and bedrooms would not fit on a lot less than 5.668m wide. The development complies with overshadowing requirements and has in fact been built to minimise overshadowing to adjoining outdoor living areas.</p> <p>Not correct, we have amended the plans to refine the walls and the neighbour at 36 Cleaver has supported the proposal and the area is characterised by at least two storey boundary walls, as approved at the 5 dwellings at 37 Cleaver, and as an area of transition this should be appropriated considered as the existing and future character of the area and as such a positive contribution to the amenity.</p> <p>Proposal is in compliance with overshadowing requirements.</p> <p>Proposal is in compliance with overshadowing requirements. And has been designed to minimise impact on adjoining outdoor living areas, noting the large blank screen to the rear units already overshadows this area through the initial bad design of these dwellings.</p> <p>Carports have been setback appropriately and need to face the primary street to facilitate access, R80 sites do not allow for garages to be screened from the street, noting R80 sites are average of 120m<sup>2</sup> in area</p>
General Comments Received:	Applicant Comments:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Concerned about the vibrations which will result</li> </ul>	<p>Yes we will do dilapidation reports for adjoining properties</p>

Comments Received in Objection:	Applicant Comment:
<p>throughout the construction of the development.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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> <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>- 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> <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>	<p>We have provided updated details as well as analysis of the streetscape and ROW and not that we have addressed all Design Committee requested and amended the facades and sides for articulation.</p> <p>Drawings comply with City of Vincent requirements</p> <p>Not agreed, see updated plans</p> <p>Not agreed, see updated plans</p> <p>Noted and agreed, good quality R80 grouped dwellings and apartments are what are encouraged in this area, and there must be some discretion when building grouped dwellings on smaller lots with 100 year old subdivision layouts, that cannot not feasibly fit multiple dwellings. This assists Council to meet their density targets and provides a diverse 3 bedroom product at the higher density without competing with the 1 and 2 bedroom multiple dwellings.</p> <p>Screening provided where required to balconies, noting the ROW is public and we provide articulation and passive surveillance to it.</p>

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