

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.

Change of Use to Office

Comments Received Neither Supporting or Objecting:	Officer Technical Comment:
<p><u>Land Use</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Concerns raised relating to the proposed 'Office' use. Submissions note that the development plans show an Office of a generous scale that could accommodate more than the one proposed employee.Concerns raised in regards the appropriateness of a non-residential use within a residential area.Submissions request that this section of Vincent Street remain as residential. Concerns raised in regards to the impact of the commercial use (and future signage) will have on the character of the existing house and the broader streetscape.Concerns raised that the proposed change of use would set a precedent for further commercial development along Vincent Street.Concerns raised in regards to the impact of the proposed Office on the amenity of Hyde Park.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">The applicant has amended the development application to propose and Unlisted Use (Millinery). A condition of approval has been recommended to ensure a maximum of one employee and three customers occupy the premises at any one time.The development proposes to operate at a low scale and will retain the existing federation style home on the subject site. The level of activity proposed is considered similar to that of a Single House and is therefore considered to be compatible with the residential zone.A condition of approval has been recommended requiring a maximum of one sign on the property with an area not greater than 0.5 square metres.The merit of any future development applications will be determined on a case by case basis.As above, the proposal will maintain the existing Single House on the subject site, which has federation characteristics. The preservation of the existing building on the site with no modification proposed to the external façade is considered to maintain and enhance the existing streetscape character.
<p><u>Parking</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Concerns raised in regards to the lack of on street parking on the subject site. Submission notes that the proposed Office building could accommodate a greater work force than the proposed one employees.Submission notes that there is already limited on-street parking available on Norfolk Street and query what the total parking demand for the development is (employees, clients and suppliers).	<ul style="list-style-type: none">As above, the applicant has amended the development application to propose and Unlisted Use (Millinery). A condition of approval has been recommended to ensure a maximum of one employee and three customers occupy the premises at any one time.The development is proposed to operate 9:00am to 5:00pm Monday to Friday, which is considered to be the off-peak period for the on-street car parking available along Vincent Street and Norfolk Street. The subject site is also located within close proximity to the Fitzgerald Street and William Street high frequency bus route.The development is currently operating from its current location at No. 323 Fitzgerald Street with one car bay. The City has no records of receiving any complaints in relation to car parking at this property.Given the above, it is considered that there is sufficient parking on the site and within the immediate locality, along with adequate public transport to service the development.
<p><u>Other</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Submissions suggest conditioning the approval to ensure the proposed operates as proposed, with regards to number of employees, client visitation and hours of operation.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">A condition of approval have been recommended ensure the development operates within the proposed parameters.

Summary of Submissions:

Change of Use to Unlisted Use (Millinery)

Comments Received in Objection:	Officer Technical Comment:
<p><u>Land Use</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Submissions raised concerns in regards the appropriateness of a non-residential use within a residential area and that the proposal will set a precedent for future commercial uses.• Commercial business are considered inappropriate opposite to Hyde Park. Submission notes that there are only four non-residential uses located along the streets fronting Hyde Park.• Concerns raised in regards to the scale of the subject building.• Submissions suggest that should the application be approved, appropriate conditions are imposed that require the development to operate as outlined by the applicant; and that any future signage is of a small scale that is consistent with a home business.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• As discussed above, the development proposes to operate at a low scale with the level of activity being considered similar to that of a Single House. The preservation of the existing building is considered to maintain and enhance the existing streetscape character. Based on this, the development is considered compatible with the residential zone.• A condition of approval has been recommended to ensure a maximum of one employee and three customers occupy the premises at any one time. Another condition of approval has been recommended requiring a maximum of one sign on the property with an area not greater than 0.5 square metres, which is consistent with the signage requirements of a Home Business.
<p><u>Parking</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Concerns raised in regards to the lack of on-site car parking. Submissions note that the on-street parking along Vincent Street and Norfolk Street is already congested.• Concerns regarding the safety of the intersection at Vincent Street and Norfolk Street.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• As discussed above, it is considered that there is sufficient parking on the site and within the immediate locality, along with adequate public transport to service the development.• The development proposes to utilise the existing approved vehicle access crossovers to Norfolk Street and the ROW. The level of activity proposed is considered to be similar to that of a standard residential dwelling in terms of vehicle trips. The potential occurrence vehicle conflict at the nearby intersection cannot be managed through the development approval process.
<p><u>Other</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Submission notes that substantial investment has been made into residential property on Vincent Street. Submission notes the current sale price of properties on Vincent Street.• Concerns in regards to the aesthetics and safety of the verge car parking bays.• The proposed use is substantially in excess of what would be allowed in a residential area as a 'Home Business' under the City's Policy No. 7.5.9 – Home Business, Home Occupation and Home Office and Home Store.• <i>'It appears the granny flat was built with this change of use in mind – it effectively becomes the main residence under this proposal. If this is so, the granny flat approval was apparently obtained under false pretences. Does this proposed configuration and use comply with the general requirements for granny flats or any specific condition of approval?'</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Perceptions on estate prices are not a relevant planning concern and cannot be considered in the assessment of a development application.• The car parking bays provided within the verge area are outside of the scope of this development application. The matter has been referred to the City's Assets and Engineering team for further investigation.• The development application does not seek approval for a Home Business and is therefore not subject to the requirements of Policy No. 7.5.9 – Home Business, Home Occupation and Home Office and Home Store. The development cannot be assessed as a Home Business as the business owner is not residing at the subject site.• The existing Ancillary Dwelling meets the minimum requirements for car parking and outdoor living areas and therefore can be considered a Single House, should the Unlisted (Millinery) be approved. The details of the original Ancillary Dwelling approval are not available to

Summary of Submissions:

Comments Received in Objection:	Officer Technical Comment:
<p>Non-residential uses within the residential zone should be secondary to the primary residential uses, occupying no more than 50 percent of the residential component. There is no indication that someone will be living in the granny flat.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• <i>'With the proposed configuration, the front of the building would be 'dead' outside of business hours, with no visual or other interaction – in conflict with one of the key principles of 'Safer Design' or 'Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design' (CPTED) (https://www.healthyplaces.org.au/userfiles/file/Safety_and_Surveillance_June09.pdf). This is particularly important given the limited visual interaction of the adjoining new developments of 110 and 112 Vincent Street.'</i>	<p>the public without the landowners consent.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Applications for Unlisted Uses are determined on a case by case basis, based on the compatibility of the use with the objectives of the Residential zone. The City has no planning requirements requiring a proportion of a commercial application to be residential.• The application relates to a change of use only with no physical modifications proposed to the built form. The referenced 'Crime Prevention through Environmental Design' fact sheet relates to the design of new buildings, streets and neighbourhoods. The proposal will maintain the existing dwelling on site, which includes open style fencing, veranda and windows that provide integration to the street. The approved development at No. 110-112 Vincent Street, North Perth is a separate matter and falls outside of the scope of this development application.

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