

Summary of Submissions:

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

Comments Received in Support:	Applicant Comment:
No comments provided on submission for support.	The owners of 377 Walcott requested we use a collaborative approach with the City Statutory Planners including meetings with Remajee Narroo— Senior Urban Planner, Co-ordinator of Land Development Anne Munyard, the original neighbours details received from the City's A/Senior Rates Officer Ronel de Lange early last year, the DAC- culminating with the outcome with the current plans revision F .

Comments Received in Objection and/or Raising Concerns:	Applicant Comment:
<p>Issue: Land Use</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The proposed Multiple Dwellings are inconsistent with the character of this section of Walcott Street, which comprises of single dwellings. 2. The amenity of the area has already been impacted by nearby large-scale subdivisions. This high-density development will result in a further loss of residential amenity. 	<p>1 & 2. The development is ostensibly only two storeys as seen from Walcott St. The area already has a number of two storey homes and unit developments and the proposed building fits easily within the bulk, height and scale parameters of the current planning scheme requirements.</p>
<p>Issue: Building Height/Plot Ratio</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The development dwarfs over the surrounding properties and will have a visual impact on nearby dwellings. 2. The development is 12 metres in height and will create substantial overshadowing to the adjoining dwelling. This will reduce the adjoining dwelling's access to natural light and ability to utilise sustainable energy sources. 3. The proposed variation to the plot ratio requirement is considered excessive and an over development of the site. This is not considered consistent with the R50 density coding. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The development from the street frontage and the two neighbouring properties is only two storeys high. The third storey is undercroft > 50% buried and is only visible for the rear access laneway. Then roof top storage area is not visible from the neighbouring properties. 2. The height stated is not correct. The overshadowing is well within the R-Codes and Town Planning scheme requirements. The overshadowing is 34.28% whereas the R60 limit is 50%. The proposed design has minimal impact to current neighbouring windows and outdoor space (the shadow has increased over the existing neighbours roof cover. The existing house already casts shadows over #375 Walcott adjoining windows – therefore there is no material change. 3. The plot ratio is 5% over the code requirement. (Also refer email in relation to site area and proposed resumption). This is however within the bounds of what is often approved and is not excessive. The plot ratio is slightly above code as the apartments are designed in accordance with the Liveable Housing Design Guidelines for improved design and community and disability outcomes. Under these requirements, the areas of bathrooms, passageways, bedrooms etc are larger to accommodate disability (Liveable Housing Standards and NDIS housing requirements) and aging-in-place residents. (Further information can be provided regarding this aspect of the design). The extra plot ratio is therefore justified on the basis of this extra amenity and

Summary of Submissions:

Comments Received in Objection and/or Raising Concerns:	Applicant Comment:
<p>4. The level of excavation and boundary walls is considered excessive within the context of the proposed variations to plot ratio and setbacks.</p> <p>5. The proposed storeroom is considered to be an odd and unnecessary addition that adds bulk to the development. This is considered to have a negative impact on the adjoining properties. The development meets the storage requirements of the Residential Design Codes, therefore this addition is unnecessary.</p> <p>6. Submission notes a 0.9 metre level difference between the subject site and adjoining property.</p>	<p>diversification. The addition of the lift has also resulted in an increase in plot ratio due to increased access to satisfy new NDIS requirements.</p> <p>4. Excavation and setbacks have been designed with significant collaboration with the City of Vincent Statutory Planners /Development Services, the DAC with followup meetings. We believe the current outcome demonstrates quality design and planning principles by sinking the carparking areas largely below ground and breaking up the longer facades.</p> <p>5. The loft storage area is not visible from any of the nearby properties as it is setback from the edge of the main roof line. There is no impact on adjoining properties. This is proved by the sections and images supplied in DA submission.</p> <p>6. Based on existing levels, there is already more than 0.5m and up to 1.5m between the existing property/floor levels and the neighbouring properties. There is therefore only a relatively minor increase to this in the new design with additional screening than currently exists. Pre-demolition photos show overlooking to both side neighbours and records a rear veranda /balcony height of 1.2 m above adjacent Alfresco up to 1.5m without screening. Proposed design incorporates screening to meet the current codes so will be an improved outcome for both neighbours. Refer Photos and notes attached of existing overlooking.</p>
<p>Issue: Built Form (General)</p> <p>7. Concerns in regards to the development's presentation to the right-of-way and the dominance of the car parking area. The presentation is considered to detract from the amenity of the right-of-way and the adjoining properties which may develop with dwellings fronting the right-of-way.</p> <p>8. Concern that the development does not meet the intent of the City's Built Form Policy with respect to the presentation to the right-of-way.</p> <p>9. Suggests the development reposition the car parking bays (parallel to the lane way) or provide screening to the car parking area or reduce the hardstand.</p>	<p>7 & 8. The right-of-way is currently defined by either 1.8m high solid fences or by garages immediately abutting the laneway. It is currently a poorly fenestrated and maintained space with no amenity or redeeming social attributes. As part of the upgrade of this space we are proposing to setback and landscape the space between the two proposed parking areas. We have allowed for extra visitor parking and the main part of the building is setback from the laneway more than 6m.</p> <p>9. The amenity of the space and the positive impact on the laneway will be significant to the point that on completion the laneway and rear frontage to this property will be far and away the most attractive along this laneway as seen in proposed coloured elevations versus the existing streetscape. This aspect of the design was favourably reviewed with the planner (Remajee Narroo) in early 2018.</p>

Summary of Submissions:

Comments Received in Objection and/or Raising Concerns:	Applicant Comment:
<p>Issue: Setbacks</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Does not conform to planning requirements. 2. The proposed lot boundary setback impose on the adjoining properties and present unacceptable building bulk. This will impact both the liveability of the dwellings and the use of the outdoor living areas. 3. The boundary walls further reduce the adjoining properties access to natural light and restricts the development potential of the adjoining properties. 4. Reduced lot boundary setbacks increase the extent of overshadowing to the adjoining property. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. We note that the town planning scheme has been designed to promote higher built form with larger setbacks than required under the RCodes. However, we have proposed a building that has similar or larger setbacks to the existing building on the site and broadly complies with the RCode R60 requirements subject to a minor concession in some areas. 2. As noted above, the building has been designed to ameliorate the impact on the neighbouring properties and in aspects of overshadowing and setback makes little or no impact and in regard to overlooking makes for a considerable improvement to the adjoining properties. However we are requesting a minor variation to the side setback requirements as per 5.1.3 of the Rcodes and Table 2A and Figure 4c. We did discussed this issue with Emily Andrews and also with Remajee Narroo prior to the DAC presentation on the 9 May 2018 who kindly resourced internal opinions and briefed us on the view that the concession could be considered based on the performance criteria outlined in 5.1.3. In that regard we have reduced the building height in order to reduce the impact on bulk and scale. The proposed setbacks do not materially reduce the amount of direct sun and ventilation and open space on either the site or on the neighbouring properties. We have also reduced the extent of overlooking from what is quite extensive in the existing situation to no overlooking in the proposed scheme. 3. This is not correct. Currently the existing house over-shadows the adjoining property and the windows in that property. There is also an existing alfresco cover 600mm from the boundary on the adjoining property which covers that area. The current shade to these areas will not change significantly under the proposed scheme. The adjoining neighbour #379 is proposing to build a zero-lot 3.8m high boundary wall for a considerable section of the common boundary. We are of the view that each solution should be looked at on its merits and do not consider that the setbacks we are proposing significantly change the amenity of either neighbour (and in fact improve it) or have any adverse effects on their development potential. 4. The overshadowing has been modelled, is significantly less than required under the RCodes. There is no additional impact to the south side neighbours' windows or courtyard open space compared to the exiting home on the site. Any added shadow from the new development is cast over existing <i>roof</i> areas
<p>Issue: Visual Privacy</p>	

Summary of Submissions:

Comments Received in Objection and/or Raising Concerns:	Applicant Comment:
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Does not conform to planning requirements. 2. Multiple windows are overlooking the adjoining properties. 3. Concerns in regards to overlooking from the stairwells to the adjoining properties. Request screening be included to maintain visual privacy to the adjoining development. 4. Concerns in regards to overlooking from the proposed storage space on the third level. 	<p>1&2. This is not correct. There are no windows that directly overlook neighbours that are major openings or are visually permeable. Conversely, the existing home on the site does have significant overlooking of the adjoining properties currently (refer emailed photos evidencing overlooking). The proposed building actually, improves and protects the visual privacy of the adjoining neighbours.</p> <p>3. The stairway windows are obscure and therefore there is no overlooking of neighbours. These windows are to allow light into the space - not for outlook. As noted, – overlooking impact has been reduced from the existing home and the proposal is now compliant with the RCodes.</p> <p>4. Based on window size and location there is no possible overlooking from the storage level – this was clearly demonstrated ‘Section B-B drawing A-14 Rev F’ and had been discussed with senior Planners DAC throughout last year.</p>
<p>Issue: Overshadowing</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Concerns in regards to the overshadowing generated from the proposal and the impact of the overshadowing on the amenity of the adjoining lot to the south. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. As referred in comments above, the overshadowing has been modelled and is significantly less than required under the RCodes. (Refer to Plan A-03 Rev F)
<p>Issue: Traffic</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The development includes eight car bays that will be accessed by the right-of-way. This is considered excessive and will create addition traffic on the right of way, which will create a safety hazard for the children who currently use the laneway for travel and play. 2. The development will overcrowd the right of way and will create on-going disruption to the other users of the right-of-way. 3. The development will create additional traffic to Walcott Street, which is already a busy road due to the proximity to the Charles Street, Wanneroo Road and Walcott Street intersection. 4. Concerns in regards to property damage from increased traffic on the laneway and additional cars parked on the nearby streets. 5. The development has not made allowance for traffic access via Walcott Street. 6. Concerns that the existing right-of-way does not have the capacity to cater for the additional traffic from the development. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Based on the current existing 29 properties on the right-of-way (including this property) there is potentially around 58 cars with direct access to the carriageway (excluding other through traffic). This building could add an additional 6 cars to the traffic if all visitor bays are used. This is considered a minimal increase. 2. The right-of-way is designed and designated as a traffic way and the volume of traffic is well below the capacity of the carriageway. 3. The extra traffic on Walcott St will be completely insignificant compared to current traffic flows. 4. This is not a planning issue 5. There is no vehicle access allowed by City of Vincent from Walcott St as dictated by Anne Munyard (Engineering) in early 2018. 6. The right-of-way is designed and designated as a traffic way and the volume of traffic is well below the capacity of the carriageway.

Summary of Submissions:

Comments Received in Objection and/or Raising Concerns:	Applicant Comment:
<p>7. Allowing the development to utilise the right-of-way for eight vehicles contradicts the City’s safe streets and laneway initiatives.</p>	<p>7. Suggest City of Vincent to comment?</p>
<p>Issue: Car Parking</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Concerns in regards to the visitors of the development parking on nearby residential streets. It is noted that the site is located close to Kyilla School and Farmers Markets, which generates a large demand for car parking. 2. Proposed visitor car parking is considered insufficient and will result in visitors parking on the right of way. Noting the development provides two-bedroom units which would likely accommodate a couple with two cars. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Three extra visitor bays are proposed – well above the normal provision required. Additionally, this development is designed to Liveable Housing Design Guidelines and in accordance with the NDIS Special Disability Housing requirements. Some of the residents will not be able to drive and not own a motor vehicle. There is also excellent access to public transport on Walcott St. (deemed a “High Frequency” bus route) 2. The carparking numbers conforms to the requirements of the RCodes and the town planning scheme.
<p>Issue: Landscaping</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Concerns of the viability of the proposed tree being located centrally within the car parking area. 2. Concerns the root systems will cause damage to nearby infrastructure and properties. 3. Concerns the proposed tree species are known to cause allergies. 4. Should the development be approved, it is requested the developer plant mature trees. 5. Submission queries when a development is required to meet the canopy cover requirements and how this can be enforced by the City. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The initiative to have deep root zones and plant larger trees is supported by the owner/developer/architect. The inclusion of a larger tree at both the front and rear of the development is provided. The clearances, space and viability of the two trees is support by our landscape designer. 2. The use of root barriers is proposed where the roots are likely to affect soak wells, services and other infrastructure on or around the site. 3. Unaware of any allergies from the proposed trees. These species are prolific and well known in this vicinity. 4. The developer does intend to plant advanced trees. 5. City of Vincent to comment?
<p>Issue: Other</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Concerns in regards to the construction process and the impact of the tradesperson parking on and blocking the right-of-way. 2. The development will have a negative impact on the property values of the nearby single houses. Noting that the single houses in the area may not have been purchased if development such as this was in the area. 3. Adjoining properties are misrepresented on the elevations and perspectives. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A construction management plan can be provided at building permit/construction stage covering this aspect. 2. The existing house is an eyesore and derelict. New development will typically increase property prices and promote urban renewal in the immediate area, so a likely outcome is the reverse of this statement. 3. We have checked these and they seem correct. We are unaware of any discrepancy between the existing and what is drawn. We have included the outline of the proposed development at the rear of the #379 Walcott St for reference and clarity.

Summary of Submissions:

Comments Received in Objection and/or Raising Concerns:	Applicant Comment:
<ul style="list-style-type: none">4. Suggestions for more speedbumps, lighting, mirrors and signage be incorporated in the right-of-way to create a more pedestrian safe environment.5. Concerns the development will establish an undesirable precedent for the future development of the right-of-way.6. Maintenance by the strata would not include maintenance of the car bays, meaning the car bays may become unsightly.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">4. City of Vincent to comment?5. City of Vincent to comment?6. This is not correct - maintenance of the carbays <u>is</u> part of the strata requirements.

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