

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 Objection:	Officer Technical Comment:
<p><u>Street Setback</u></p> <p>The proposed street setback is considered to be inconsistent with the established street setback of Egina Street. Most specifically, the adjoining dwellings. The development is not considered to meet the Design Principles of the Built Form Policy as the development has not preserved the existing streetscape.</p> <p>The proposal does not enhance the existing visual Streetscape as there are no other side-by-side developments on Egina Street. The existing streetscape comprises of single detached dwelling and does not contain 'terrace style' dwellings or grouped dwellings. Concerns raised on the proposed development creating a precedent for terrace style housing.</p> <p>The reduced street setback is considered to increase the prominence of the garages and provides no visual connectivity between the dwelling at ground level and the streetscape.</p> <p>The proposed street setback does not provide adequate space for landscaping and car parking outside of the garage.</p> <p>The upper level overhang is considered to provide an imposing streetscape presence and bulk within the front setback area.</p>	<p>The applicant has provided amended plans to incorporate a range of materials and finishes including face brick and banding, wooden timber detailing and elements of render. The incorporation of a face brick element and the wooden detailing responds to the existing developments along the Egina Street and within the broader Mount Hawthorn area. This is considered to tie the development into the existing streetscape character.</p> <p>Although the adjoining properties are setback approximately 7.8 metres and 8.2 metres respectfully, there are dwellings located on Egina Street with a street setback of 4.5 metres. Meaning the proposed development is consistent with some of the established street setbacks on Egina Street.</p> <p>The lot configuration of the subject site was established through the subdivision approval issued by Western Australian Planning Commission. The subject site met the minimum and average lot sizes to facilitate subdivision in accordance with the R30 density code.</p> <p>The applicant has provided amended plans that has set the front doors of the dwelling forward by 2.3 metres. The setting forward of the front door combined with the passive surveillance provided by the balconies is considered to provide visual connection to the street.</p> <p>The development provides two on-site car bays for each dwelling, which meets the deemed-to-comply requirement of the Residential Design Codes (R Codes) for the provision of car parking. A condition of approval has been recommended for an amended landscape plan to be provide to achieve the City's 30 percent canopy cover requirement. It is noted the application has provided amended plans demonstrating compliance with the 15 percent deep soil zone requirements.</p> <p>The proposed dwellings provide balconies that overhang the garages of the dwellings. The overhang of the balconies adds detail and articulation in the façade, which is considered to aid in moderating the impact of the building bulk and scale.</p>

Summary of Submissions:

Comments Received in Objection:	Officer Technical Comment:
<p data-bbox="109 207 569 235"><u>Lot Boundary Setback/Boundary Walls</u></p> <p data-bbox="109 258 1020 347">The proposed lot boundary setbacks do not meet the requirements of the City's Built Form Policy. The proposed lot boundary setbacks are considered to present significant building bulk to the adjoining properties.</p> <p data-bbox="109 493 1020 704">The development does not provide adequate ventilation to the adjoining properties. The development will block the adjoining properties access to natural light, which will impact on the usability of the adjoining property's outdoor living area and habitable rooms. There is also the potential for the development to overshadow the adjoining properties solar panels. The cumulative impact of the overshadowing of the development is considered to have significant impact on the adjoining property.</p> <p data-bbox="109 727 1020 846">The proposed nil setback for the balconies and the proposed screening is considered inadequate to provide privacy to the adjoining properties. Further steps could be taken to reduce the impact on the adjoining properties. For example, a 1.8m privacy screen.</p> <p data-bbox="109 901 1020 1019">The proposed balconies are located too close to the bedrooms of the surrounding dwellings and facilitate overlooking into the adjoining properties front yards. This does not provide adequate privacy for residents or adjacent and opposite neighbours.</p>	<p data-bbox="1047 258 1982 470">The City notes that the upper level setback variations were advertised in error. The only lot boundary setback variation relates to a select 5.6 metre portion of wall on the ground level of the southern façade, which is setback 1.2 metres in lieu of the required 1.7 metres. The remaining portion of the southern façade is setback 1.7 metres, which exceeds the deemed-to-comply requirement. As a result, it is considered that the proposal is unlikely to result in an adverse impact on the neighbouring habitable rooms or outdoor living space.</p> <p data-bbox="1047 493 1982 644">The development provides 30.39 percent overshadowing to the adjoining property located to the south. The Residential Design R Codes permits a maximum of 35 percent overshadowing to the adjoining property under the R30 density coding. The development complies with the deemed-to-comply for overshadowing under the R Codes.</p> <p data-bbox="1047 727 1982 878">The balconies are setback 1.9 metres from the southern lot boundary and 1.2 metres from the northern lot boundary. Both balconies provide a 1.6 metre high visual privacy screen that restricts overlooking to the adjoining properties. The 1.6 metre high privacy screen meets the deemed-to-comply requirements of the R Codes for visual privacy.</p> <p data-bbox="1047 901 1982 961">The visual privacy requirements of the R Codes do not apply to the front setback area (front yard).</p>
<p data-bbox="109 1027 319 1055"><u>Garages Setback</u></p> <p data-bbox="109 1084 1020 1235">The proposed garage setbacks do not meet the requirements of the City's Built Form Policy. The proposed garages create significant building bulk at the front of the site and are not consistent with the established streetscape. The proposed garages are not considered to preserve or enhance the existing streetscape.</p> <p data-bbox="109 1360 1020 1479">The proposed garages are considered to create a safety issue for pedestrians using the footpath. The proposed garages are located closer to the foot path and do not provide clear sightlines may obstruct the neighbouring properties view when reversing.</p>	<p data-bbox="1047 1084 1982 1328">The development proposes to have the garages set forward 2.4 metres (north) and 3.0 metres (south) in front of the building line of the dwellings on the ground level. The proposed overhang of the upper level balcony and the incorporation of alternative colours and materials is considered to mitigate the perception of building bulk through providing articulation and contributing to the existing streetscape character. It is noted that the garage at Nos. 50 and 52 Egina Street are set forward of the dwelling, meaning the proposed garage is not considered to be inconsistent with the existing streetscape.</p> <p data-bbox="1047 1360 1982 1421">The development meets the deemed-to-comply requirements of the R Codes for vehicle sightlines.</p>

Summary of Submissions:

Comments Received in Objection:	Officer Technical Comment:
<p><u>Garages Width</u></p> <p>The proposed design is considered to be out of character and scale with the existing streetscape. The development's frontage is completely operated by building mass with the dominant garages and overhanging balconies that project building bulk that is inconsistent with the existing streetscape.</p> <p>Two solid garage doors is considered to dominate the frontage. The proposed garages have a significantly greater width than the existing garages located in the area. The visual connectivity between the dwelling and the streetscape is therefore lost.</p> <p><i>'It is inconsistent with Spp 3.1 residential design codes 1. 5.2.2 Garage Width. The application proposes a 28% increase on the deemed to comply provisions, which allow for 50% of the frontage. The application is not eligible to increase the garages to 60% because the upper floors do not extend the full width of the garage. By my calculations, a greater variation is proposed; lot A has a width of 7.590 and Lot B has a width of 7.490m providing a combined frontage of 15.08m. The garages are 6.09m and 5.99 wide, which combined would account for 80% of the frontage. Considering intramaps which shows a frontage of 15.2m this is still 79% of the frontage. The garages dominate the streetscape and compliance can't be demonstrated with the Design Principles.'</i></p>	<p>The variation to the garage width was advertised in error. The deemed-to-comply requirements of the R Codes outlines that the garage width requirements only applies where the garage is located in front of within 1.0 metres of the building. The R Codes definition of a building includes structures that are appurtenant to a dwelling, such as a balcony. As the garages are located 1.2 metres behind the balconies, this provision of the R Codes does not apply.</p>
<p><u>Site Works</u></p> <p>There is no indication or allowance on development drawings for retaining walls within development.</p>	<p>Noted, any future retaining greater than 0.5 metres on the property boundary will be subject to development approval from the City.</p>
<p><u>Other</u></p> <p>Concerns relating to the intensity of the development and appropriateness for higher density development within this area of Mount Hawthorn. Concerns that this style of development will set a precedent for Egina Street. The proposed development frontage are in the order of 7.6 metres each which are significantly smaller than the existing lot frontages on Egina Street and surrounding area.</p>	<p>As above, the lot configuration of the subject site was established through the subdivision approval issued by Western Australian Planning Commission. The subject site met the minimum and average lot sizes to facilitate subdivision in accordance with the R30 density code. The subject site is afforded a two storey building height limit under the City's Built Form Policy, meaning the proposal is compliant with the applicable building height limit. The proposal is considered to be an appropriate density and scale, given the compliance with site area and building height requirements.</p>

Summary of Submissions:

Comments Received in Objection:	Officer Technical Comment:
<p>The development does not comply with the landscaping provisions outlined in the City's Built Form Policy with regards to canopy cover and deep soil zones. The proposed development is not considered to meet the design principles for landscaping under the City's Built From Policy.</p> <p>The development greatly exceeds the 45 percent minimum outdoor requirement and provides little green space.</p> <p>Request for the application to be determined by Council.</p> <p>Submissions note that comment could be made on drawing 1580_DA 2 of 10 as it was not provided.</p> <p><i>'Pre-demolition comment of "Timber pailing fence in fair condition" was accurate prior to demolition, however fence was damaged during demolition and needs replacing as part of any development.'</i></p>	<p>The applicant has provided amended plans bringing the development into compliance with the required 15 percent deep soil zones. A condition of approval has been recommended requiring an updated landscape plan to be provided demonstrating compliance with the 30 percent canopy cover requirement.</p> <p>The proposal provides 46 percent open space which meets the deemed-to-comply requirements of the R Codes for 45 percent open space.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Drawing '1580_DA2' is the proposed Strata Plan. The proposed Strata Plan does not form part of the application for development approval and as such was not advertised. It is noted that the Western Australian Planning Commission has issued approval for two green title lots on the subject site. Meaning the subdivision will no longer be Strata.</p> <p>Boundary fencings are a civil matter and are not subject to development approval from the City.</p>

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