

Summary of Submissions:

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

Comments Received in Support:	Officer Technical Comment:
<u>Street Setback</u> 5 metres setback is better	The development has increased the setback to 5.1 metres.
<u>Landscaping</u> Variation of 48.4 percent hardstand is minor	The hardstand area has reduced and now complies with the R Codes requirements.
<u>Building Height</u> Proposed increase is minor	Noted.

Comments Received in Objection:	Officer Technical Comment:
<u>Parking and Access</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The development will increase on street parking, particularly as there is lack of visitor parking and resident parking (for two bedrooms) Number of car bays and access to the development will create disturbance to adjoining properties. No two way access will create parking issues on site and for pedestrians passing by. 	<p>The development exceeds the required number of parking bays required in accordance with R Codes Clause 6.3.3 – Parking, with 8 bays required and 10 proposed.</p> <p>The access has been considered by the City's Engineers to be sufficient, with there being adequate space within the lot boundary to allow for vehicles to pass and enter/exit the street in forward gear.</p>
<u>Street Setback</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Setback is not compliant with the required setback. The reduced setback will erode the streetscape as the development will be significantly forward of existing dwellings along the street. 	<p>The applicant has amended the proposal and the street setback is now compliant with the requirements of Clause 5.2 of the Built Form Policy. The compliant street setback ensures that the development does not significantly protrude in front of the existing developments along the street and as such will not erode the existing views along the streetscape.</p>
<u>Lot Boundary Setback</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Setbacks requirements should be compliant. The reduced setbacks result in bulk and reduces access to sunlight. The increase in boundary wall height reduces in bulk. The number of setback variations is excessive. Rear setback variations will reduce the opportunity to plant vegetation that will assist in reducing building bulk and protecting the privacy of the adjoining residents. The reduced setbacks will impact access to sunlight to living areas and courtyards. 	<p>The applicant has amended the proposal and all setbacks to lot boundaries comply with the requirements of the R Codes. The boundary walls have also been reduced to comply with the maximum and average permitted heights of 3.5 metres and 3.0 metres respectively.</p> <p>The compliant setbacks reduce the overall impact of bulk from the development to the adjoining properties, which has also been mitigated through the use of contrasting materials within the building façade.</p> <p>Whilst the development will result in overshadowing, the shadow cast has been reduced with the compliant setbacks. The overshadowing proposed is as per the Residential Design Codes (R Codes) requirements for an R40 site.</p>

Summary of Submissions:

Comments Received in Objection:	Officer Technical Comment:
<p><u>Building Height</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Height requirements should be compliant.• Increase in height results in bulk and an eye sore.	<p>The development as viewed from the street does not propose a variation to the building height, with the height variation located towards the centre and rear of the lot. As the variation is largely to the centre of the lot and adjacent to two storey dwellings, the height is considered to be appropriate to the neighbourhood context and streetscape character, and not dominate over the existing developments along Woodville Street and properties fronting the nearby laneway.</p> <p>The height of the development varies along the northern, southern and eastern boundaries to be a maximum of 0.4m above the permitted height and as such the impact of building bulk is considered to be minimised.</p> <p>The proposal includes various roof forms and materials including a pitched roof, concealed roof, render and brick which assists in mitigating the impact of bulk as viewed from the street and surrounding properties.</p>
<p><u>Landscaping</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• There is no vegetation to soften the solar mass.• The design does not conform with the green canopy requirements and has limited potential to sustain a green canopy in the future.• Reduced street setback minimised landscaping area.• Minimal area for landscaping to grow.• Overdevelopment of the site has resulted in reduced landscaping requirements.• Reduced landscaping will impact on the 'feel' of the area as there is less open space and garden area as viewed from the street.• There is too much covered area (from buildings and driveways).	<p>The applicant amended the plans to comply with the Residential Design Codes requirement of a maximum of 50 percent hard stand within the front setback area which will allow for additional landscaping on the site as viewed from the street.</p> <p>To allow for a larger green canopy on the subject site and to mitigate the impact of development bulk from the building and vehicle access areas, it has been recommended that a condition imposing the requirement of 18.4 percent of the site being canopy cover (at maturity) and 22 percent overall.</p> <p>The proposal complies with the R Codes requirements of open space on the subject site with 45% open space required and 59.5 percent open space provided.</p>
<p><u>Bulk</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The development appears as a concrete mass.• Smaller scale development would be more appropriate.• Height of fencing appears high.	<p>The development as viewed from the street appears as a single dwelling and the proposed materials and finishes of the development area considered to be consistent with the developments along the immediate streetscape and locality.</p> <p>The proposed fencing heights are in accordance with the deemed-to-comply requirements of the City's Built Form Policy.</p>

Summary of Submissions:

Comments Received in Objection:	Officer Technical Comment:
<p><u>Zoning</u></p> <p>North Perth Precinct only allows for developments to an R40 standard where dwelling is retained.</p>	<p>Multiple dwellings are permitted in this area in accordance with Local Planning Scheme No. 2. Additionally, the subject site is not split coded and as such can be developed to the R40 standards.</p>
<p><u>Site Works and Retaining</u></p> <p>Fill and retaining requirements should be compliant.</p>	<p>The proposed retaining and fill on site have been reduced to be no more than 0.5metres above natural ground level in accordance with the deemed-to-comply requirements of the R Codes.</p>
<p><u>Streetscape</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed development is not sympathetic to the character of the street. • Development does not contribute to the streetscape and character of North Perth. • The number of developments is not consistent with the single house developments on the streetscape. • The proposal does not preserve nor enhance the visual character of the streetscape. • Proposal does not complement the area particularly the amenity of the area which sees large gardens and open space. 	<p>The proposed development has been amended from those advertised in regards to street setback and as such is considered to be more consistent with the streetscape. The development incorporates a pitched roof design and materials and finishes which are in line with the existing developments along the street.</p> <p>The compliant street setback and landscaping within the street setback area allows for a more open area and greenery within the streetscape. The single width crossover at the minimum requirement of 3.0 metres assists in reducing the hard stand area along the streetscape.</p> <p>The City's Local Planning Scheme No. 2 and the R Codes allow for the development of multiple dwellings on R40 sites within this area.</p>
<p><u>Privacy</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The balconies of unit 5 and unit 6 will overlook into habitable spaces of adjoining property. • Inadequate screening proposed to the foyers. 	<p>The proposal complies with the requirements of Clause 6.4.1 – Visual Privacy of the R Codes. The balconies are required to be screened to 1.6metres above finished floor level and a condition will be recommended to this affect. Additionally, the foyer areas are not considered to be habitable areas of the development and as such are not required to be screened.</p>
<p><u>Social and Environment</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The colour of the roof being dark (black) will adversely impact the environment. • High density living creates antisocial behaviour and noise pollution. • The development negatively impacts on the unique sense of place of the North Perth area. • The impact on future residents of the development of providing inadequate protection for neighbours has been overlooked. • Noise concerns from the parking area. • Safety of residents in the area due to increase in traffic. 	<p>The proposed roof colour, antisocial behaviour and noise are not a matter for planning to consider.</p> <p>The access has been considered by the City's Engineers to be sufficient, with there being adequate space within the lot boundary to allow for vehicles to pass and enter/exit the street in forward gear which will assist in ensuring the safety of the residents in the area.</p>

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