

**First Community Consultation - Summary of Submissions:**

Total number of submissions received: 40

Total number of objections received: 40

Total number of support submissions received: 0

Total number of submissions that neither objected nor supported: 0

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

<b>Community Comments Received in Objection:</b>	<b>Applicant Response:</b>
<p><u>Building Height:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerns relating to rooftop terrace - too high and provides visual intrusion into neighbouring properties</li> <li>• Significant amenity impacts to the adjoining properties</li> <li>• Increases overlooking to adjoining properties</li> <li>• Mass and scale of the building impacts the neighbouring properties</li> <li>• Sets negative precedence for future development</li> <li>• Noise from the rooftop will adversely impact the amenity of the area</li> <li>• Building height has adverse amenity impacts on the adjoining properties. Results in visual privacy issues, dominating visual bulk and mass</li> <li>• Rooftop is not consistent with other dwellings in the area – no roof tops found in this locality. It will be out of character</li> <li>• Development does not consider neighbour amenity</li> <li>• Heights should comply and reduced to two storeys only. Height and boundary walls result in large imposing and overshadowing building.</li> </ul>	<p><u>Building Height:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Heights and overlooking issues have been amended on the current plans.</li> <li>• Impact has been reduced with the change to eastern elevation aesthetics. Eastern Elevation (56 Kalgoorlie Street) is the only neighbour potentially impacted by amenity prior to the elevation changes.</li> <li>• Overlooking issues have been rectified in the current submission.</li> <li>• Plans have been amended to reduce impact</li> <li>• The current house adds no additional value or streetscape to the area. The applicant is not willing to create a fake post-war era house. Measures have been taken on the current plans by changing the elevation to increase its integration with the streetscape.</li> <li>• Noise from a rooftop is not a planning consideration. It should be determined under the Health Act in the event of a noise complaint.</li> <li>• Heights have been amended on the current plans.</li> <li>• The rooftop has no implications on character. Character component in question is the elevation. Character cannot be maintained due to the existing structure not being inter-war of Californian bungalow.</li> <li>• Impact has been reduced with the change to eastern elevation aesthetics which was mainly impacted by neighbour amenity. Eastern Elevation (56 Kalgoorlie Street) is the only neighbour impacted by amenity. The structure is two storeys.</li> <li>• Heights have been amended on the current plans. Overshadowing component is compliant as per the overshadowing plan submitted.</li> </ul>
<p><u>Street setbacks:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Contemporary design, form and scale of the development is not compatible with the established streetscape</li> <li>• Street setback will disturb continuity of the streetscape</li> <li>• Development does not align with the existing street.</li> </ul>	<p><u>Street setbacks:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The current house is not compatible with the streetscape.</li> <li>• Setbacks have been amended to comply.</li> <li>• The developments orientation is parallel with the blocks boundaries, similar to the majority of the blocks on the street.</li> </ul>

**First Community Consultation - Summary of Submissions:**

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development is overbearing to the street</li> <li>• Not in keeping with architectural styles within the street</li> <li>• Design is not sympathetic to streetscape – not enough streetscape analysis has been undertaken</li> <li>• - True character of the street is interwar and post war - development not in keeping with this</li> <li>• Façade is featureless</li> <li>• Development is unsympathetic and out of character to the street</li> <li>• the frontage is domineering with the cantilevered 2nd storey and no windows</li> <li>• Front of the dwelling does not adequately address the street – turns it back to the street rather than connecting to the street</li> <li>• Design does not attempt to adhere to standards, compliment the heritage nature of the street, or consider the impact such an imposing structure has on neighbours.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Elevation has been amended to integrate.</li> <li>• Elevation has been amended to integrate. Direct quote City of Vincent Mount hawthorn Precinct Policy “To encourage the development of a range of housing types within the precinct, offering variety in built form and typology and to facilitate housing affordability, sustainable design, diversity and choice”</li> <li>• Streetscape analysis has been undertaken and submitted with the current revision of the drawings.</li> <li>• Elevation has been amended to integrate.</li> <li>• The owner is unable to create an inter-war or post war development as we are now in the year 2018/2019, and is not willing to put a standard project home on the block therefore has opted to build an architecturally designed home.</li> <li>• Elevation has been amended.</li> <li>• Elevation has been amended to integrate.</li> <li>• Cantilever is reduced and small windows added.</li> <li>• Unable to comment as this does not make sense, the back of the house it at the rear of the block. With revised setbacks it allows a substantial front garden, in conjunction with the front balcony/terrace this will connect the house to the street.</li> <li>• Current house complies excluding the ~500mm height of screening to the roof terrace. Although this additional height is not visible from the street. “Standards” are not an issue as the building will comply with Australian Standards.</li> </ul>
<p><u>Lot boundary setbacks and lot boundary walls:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerns relating to noise pollution from the sauna and pool – too close to the boundary</li> <li>• Roof terrace will provide significant noise issues to adjoining properties and the locality – noise will travel from the terrace through the suburb. Disturbance too many residences that have children.</li> <li>• Building is unnecessarily excessive and is an overdevelopment of the narrow site</li> <li>• Boundary walls are too high – adversely impact properties in terms of mass and scale</li> </ul>	<p><u>Lot boundary setbacks and lot boundary walls:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pool pump has its own enclosed room. Sauna is internal; saunas do not create noise. Please review the plans correctly. This is an uneducated comment.</li> <li>• Noise from a rooftop is not a planning consideration. It should be determined under the Health act. The Applicant has a child also, this comment is invalid.</li> <li>• Building complies with the block coverage.</li> <li>• Heights have been amended on the current plans.</li> <li>• Setbacks have been amended to comply.</li> <li>• Boundary setbacks and landscaping have been amended to comply including canopy coverage.</li> </ul>

**First Community Consultation - Summary of Submissions:**

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Insufficient setbacks proposed – increases overlooking to all adjoining properties</li> <li>• Overdeveloped with little regard to side boundary setbacks and landscaping</li> <li>• All walls are dominating when viewed from adjoining properties and the street</li> <li>• Significant building bulk provided to adjoining properties and the street from the boundary walls and lot boundary setbacks</li> <li>• Reduces direct sunlight to adjoining properties</li> <li>• Affects the amenity of adjoining properties and reduces quality of life</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Eastern boundary elevation has been amended and the aesthetics have been increased to reduce impact on adjoining property.</li> <li>• Boundary setbacks have been changed and are compliant.</li> <li>• Overshadowing is compliant. Comment is invalid as the overshadowing plan was attached and clearly the commented cannot read plans.</li> <li>• Comment does not explain what it impacts. This point has been covered as the only adjoining property impacted has had the elevation amended.</li> </ul>
<p><u>Sightlines:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerns relating to non-compliant sightlines and pedestrian safety</li> <li>• A lot of children pass by on the pedestrian path and would be at risk due to non-compliant sightlines.</li> <li>• Sightlines pose danger to pedestrians</li> <li>• Significant safety hazard</li> <li>• Safety concerns result from sightlines proposed</li> </ul>	<p><u>Sightlines:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Front fencing has been amended to comply with site lines.</li> <li>• Front fencing has been amended to comply with site lines. Owner agrees as they also have a child.</li> <li>• Front fencing has been amended to comply with site lines.</li> <li>• Front fencing has been amended to comply with site lines.</li> <li>• Front fencing has been amended to comply with site lines.</li> </ul>
<p><u>Landscaping:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Full 15% deep soil should be provided – no reason this cannot be achieved</li> <li>• Very limited trees available on site - full canopy cover should be provided</li> <li>• Too much concrete surfaces – trees and landscaping need to be provided to reduce views to the concrete</li> </ul>	<p><u>Landscaping:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Plans have been amended to comply.</li> </ul>
<p><u>Visual Privacy:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development compromises neighbours visual privacy</li> <li>• Rear stairs overlook neighbours</li> <li>• Terrace and stairs to the rear reduce privacy to adjoining properties</li> <li>• Front terrace above the garage is too close to adjoining properties</li> <li>• Concerns relating to overlooking from the front terrace and rear stairs - major overlooking concerns.</li> <li>• Both raised terraces should be entirely screened</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Visual privacy requirements are now compliant.</li> <li>• Stairs are not a habitable room.</li> <li>• Front terrace screening has been amended.</li> <li>• Front terrace screening has been amended.</li> <li>• Visual privacy requirements are now compliant.</li> <li>• This is not a requirement.</li> </ul>
<p><u>Overshadowing:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Significant reduction of sunlight to adjoining properties</li> <li>• Rendered image does not accurately represent the winter shadow that the development will cast – image is misleading.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Overshadowing plan shows that it is compliant.</li> </ul>

**First Community Consultation - Summary of Submissions:**

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No overshadowing diagram provided. Concerns relating to shadows to the southern property.</li> <li>• Southern property will be significantly overshadowed in the winter</li> </ul>	
<p><u>Surveillance:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• development is not in keeping with the streetscape and does not provide passive surveillance to the street</li> <li>• Not consistent with the objectives of Liveable Neighbourhoods which is to increase passive and active surveillance</li> <li>• Design will not assist in reducing crime within the area</li> <li>• No windows that overlook the street and there is not visual connection to the street or street surveillance</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is a terrace above the garage which allows passive surveillance to the street. There will be Security camera's installed to the front elevation which will assist in reducing crime.</li> </ul>
<p><u>Overall development and general comments:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development has no desire to build or identify with the character and evolution of Mt Hawthorn</li> <li>• Too many areas of non-compliance proposed – results in cumulative impacts to the adjoining properties and entire locality</li> <li>• Development is at odds with the majority of residential buildings of Mt Hawthorn and detracts from the character of the suburb</li> <li>• No respect to the streetscape and the amenity of the direct neighbours and neighbourhood.</li> <li>• Development is not in keeping with surrounding homes in Mount Hawthorn</li> <li>• Development will adversely impact quality of life of neighbours</li> <li>• Front facade of house is not in keeping with the style of Mt Hawthorn</li> <li>• The Brutalist architecture, scale, bulk and nature of this proposal is not consistent with the character charm of Mt Hawthorn that makes the suburb unique and attractive</li> <li>• Overdevelopment of the site results in significantly reduced canopy cover and greenery and increased amounts of concrete</li> <li>• Development is a dangerous precedence for future approvals, particularly relating to building heights and visual privacy</li> <li>• Development is not consistent with the Mt Hawthorn Precinct Policy which ensures that the prevailing residential character of the area is protected and the form and scale of the development does not adversely impact the street</li> <li>• Development will de-value adjoining properties</li> </ul>	<p><u>Overall development and general comments:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• “Mount Hawthorn” encourages architecturally designed residences. Evolution will imply that it is evolving from the current character (inter-war and californium bungalow), into something new and modern (the current design).</li> <li>• Current plans rectify the majority of non-compliances.</li> <li>• The current house detracts from the character of the suburb.</li> <li>• Previously addressed</li> <li>• Previously addressed</li> <li>• This is not a planning issue as the impact on neighbours is now compliant.</li> <li>• Previously addressed</li> <li>• Previously addressed</li> <li>• Site is not overdeveloped, as it is compliant with the block coverage. Canopy coverage now compliant.</li> <li>• Not a planning issue.</li> <li>• Direct quote City of Vincent Mount hawthorn Precinct Policy “To encourage the development of a range of housing types within the precinct, offering variety in built form and typology and to facilitate housing affordability, sustainable design, diversity and choice”</li> <li>• This is an uneducated subjective statement. In fact the value of this property will increase the surrounding properties values. Particularly those with re-development potential, which excludes the interwar and Californian bungalow styles of architecture.</li> <li>• The development will not “have negative implications on other residents”. It is predominantly compliant in the current revision.</li> </ul>

**First Community Consultation - Summary of Submissions:**

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proposal will have negative implications on other residents of Mt Hawthorn and will set an adverse precedence for future proposals</li> <li>• House design does not belong in Mt Hawthorn</li> <li>• Development will destroy the traditional character and feel of the suburb</li> <li>• Totally out of character with adjoining residences</li> <li>• Negative precedence will be set</li> <li>• The ostentatious and brusque attitude that is demonstrated by this proposal is at odds with the relaxed, non-competitive, values-based community for which Mount Hawthorn is envied.</li> <li>• Major overdevelopment of the site</li> <li>• Building does not compliment the heritage feel of the neighbourhood.</li> <li>• Concerns for impacts to Anzac Cottage a few houses away.</li> <li>• Development is detrimental to neighbouring properties and erosion of acceptable precedence</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This is a subjective comment.</li> <li>• The current house is anything but traditional and in character to the suburb.</li> <li>• This is a false statement as the adjoining properties are 2 different styles of design. Both of them being not either inter-ware or Californian bungalow styles of architecture. Additionally those directly across from the site are modern project home style houses.</li> <li>• Not a planning issue.</li> <li>• Not a planning issue.</li> <li>• Previously addressed</li> <li>• Nor does the current house.</li> <li>• Concerns? Comment has no basis for argument.</li> <li>• Previously addressed</li> </ul>
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Topic	Count	Planning Issue	Issue Addressed	Comment
Amenity on adjoining property	5	Yes	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Significant amenity impacts to the adjoining properties</li> <li>• Mass and scale of the building impacts the neighbouring properties</li> <li>• Building height has adverse amenity impacts on the adjoining properties. Results in visual privacy issues, dominating visual bulk and mass</li> <li>• Development does not consider neighbour amenity</li> <li>• Affects the amenity of adjoining properties and reduces quality of life</li> </ul>
Block Coverage	1	Yes	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Building is unnecessarily excessive and is an overdevelopment of the narrow site</li> </ul>
Setbacks and height/Bulk and scale	7	Yes	Partially	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerns relating to rooftop terrace - too high and provides visual intrusion into neighbouring properties</li> <li>• Street setback will disturb continuity of the streetscape</li> <li>• Boundary walls are too high – adversely impact properties in terms of mass and scale</li> <li>• Insufficient setbacks proposed – increases overlooking to all adjoining properties</li> <li>• Overdeveloped with little regard to side boundary setbacks and landscaping</li> </ul>

**First Community Consultation - Summary of Submissions:**

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All walls are dominating when viewed from adjoining properties and the street</li> <li>• Significant building bulk provided to adjoining properties and the street from the boundary walls and lot boundary setbacks</li> </ul>
Elevation/heritage	19	Yes	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Contemporary design, form and scale of the development is not compatible with the established streetscape</li> <li>• Development does not align with the existing street.</li> <li>• Development is overbearing to the street</li> <li>• Not in keeping with architectural styles within the street</li> <li>• Design is not sympathetic to streetscape – not enough streetscape analysis has been undertaken</li> <li>• - True character of the street is interwar and post war - development not in keeping with this</li> <li>• Façade is featureless</li> <li>• Development is unsympathetic and out of character to the street</li> <li>• the frontage is domineering with the cantilevered 2nd storey and no windows</li> <li>• Front of the dwelling does not adequately address the street – turns it back to the street rather than connecting to the street</li> <li>• Design does not attempt to adhere to standards, compliment the heritage nature of the street, or consider the impact such an imposing structure has on neighbours.</li> <li>• development is not in keeping with the streetscape and does not provide passive surveillance to the street</li> <li>• Not consistent with the objectives of Liveable Neighbourhoods which is to increase passive and active surveillance</li> <li>• Design will not assist in reducing crime within the area</li> <li>• No windows that overlook the street and there is not visual connection to the street or street surveillance</li> <li>• development is not in keeping with the streetscape and does not provide passive surveillance to the street</li> <li>• Not consistent with the objectives of Liveable Neighbourhoods which is to increase passive and active surveillance</li> <li>• Design will not assist in reducing crime within the area</li> <li>• No windows that overlook the street and there is not visual connection to the street or street surveillance</li> </ul>

**First Community Consultation - Summary of Submissions:**

Noise	3	No	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noise from the rooftop will adversely impact the amenity of the area</li> <li>Concerns relating to noise pollution from the sauna and pool – too close to the boundary</li> <li>Roof terrace will provide significant noise issues to adjoining properties and the locality – noise will travel from the terrace through the suburb. Disturbance too many residences that have children.</li> </ul>
Overshadowing	6	Yes	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Heights should comply and reduced to two storeys only. Height and boundary walls result in large imposing and overshadowing building.</li> <li>Reduces direct sunlight to adjoining properties</li> <li>Significant reduction of sunlight to adjoining properties</li> <li>Rendered image does not accurately represent the winter shadow that the development will cast – image is misleading.</li> <li>No overshadowing diagram provided. Concerns relating to shadows to the southern property.</li> <li>Southern property will be significantly overshadowed in the winter</li> </ul>
Overlooking	6	Yes	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increases overlooking to adjoining properties</li> <li>Development compromises neighbours visual privacy</li> <li>Rear stairs overlook neighbours</li> <li>Terrace and stairs to the rear reduce privacy to adjoining properties</li> <li>Front terrace above the garage is too close to adjoining properties</li> <li>Concerns relating to overlooking from the front terrace and rear stairs - major overlooking concerns. Both raised terraces should be entirely screened</li> </ul>
Precedence for future development	1	No	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sets negative precedence for future development</li> </ul>
Front Fencing/Sightlines	4	Yes	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A lot of children pass by on the pedestrian path and would be at risk due to non-compliant sightlines.</li> <li>Sightlines pose danger to pedestrians</li> <li>Significant safety hazard</li> <li>Safety concerns result from sightlines proposed</li> </ul>
Landscaping	3	Yes	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Full 15% deep soil should be provided – no reason this cannot be achieved</li> <li>Very limited trees available on site - full canopy cover should be provided</li> <li>Too much concrete surfaces – trees and landscaping need to be provided to reduce views to the concrete</li> </ul>
Other/General Comments	16	No	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Rooftop is not consistent with other dwellings in the area – no roof tops found in this locality. It will be out of character</li> </ul>

**First Community Consultation - Summary of Submissions:**

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Development has no desire to build or identify with the character and evolution of Mt Hawthorn</li><li>• Too many areas of non-compliance proposed – results in cumulative impacts to the adjoining properties and entire locality</li><li>• Development is at odds with the majority of residential buildings of Mt Hawthorn and detracts from the character of the suburb</li><li>• No respect to the streetscape and the amenity of the direct neighbours and neighbourhood.</li><li>• Development is not in keeping with surrounding homes in Mount Hawthorn</li><li>• Development will adversely impact quality of life of neighbours</li><li>• Front facade of house is not in keeping with the style of Mt Hawthorn</li><li>• The Brutalist architecture, scale, bulk and nature of this proposal is not consistent with the character charm of Mt Hawthorn that makes the suburb unique and attractive</li><li>• Overdevelopment of the site results in significantly reduced canopy cover and greenery and increased amounts of concrete</li><li>• Development is a dangerous precedence for future approvals, particularly relating to building heights and visual privacy</li><li>• Development is not consistent with the Mt Hawthorn Precinct Policy which ensures that the prevailing residential character of the area is protected and the form and scale of the development does not adversely impact the street</li><li>• Development will de-value adjoining properties</li><li>• Proposal will have negative implications on other residents of Mt Hawthorn and will set an adverse precedence for future proposals</li><li>• House design does not belong in Mt Hawthorn</li><li>• Development will destroy the traditional character and feel of the suburb</li><li>• Totally out of character with adjoining residences</li><li>• Negative precedence will be set</li><li>• The ostentatious and brusque attitude that is demonstrated by this proposal is at odds with the relaxed, non-competitive, values-based community for which Mount Hawthorn is envied.</li><li>• Major overdevelopment of the site</li><li>• Building does not compliment the heritage feel of the neighbourhood.</li><li>• Concerns for impacts to Anzac Cottage a few houses away.</li></ul>
--	--	--	--	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------



**First Community Consultation - Summary of Submissions:**

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Development is detrimental to neighbouring properties and erosion of acceptable precedence</li></ul>
--	--	--	--	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------