

Summary of Submissions:

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

Comments Received in Support:	Applicant Comment:
<p><u>Built Form Outcome</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The development is a true example of forward-thinking design that will contribute to the value and character of the neighbourhood; Architecture like this sculpts the future direction and quality of the built form within the City of Vincent; Beautiful build that will enhance any street; Project adds to the streetscapes of Mount Hawthorn and will make a more beautiful place; Project is very innovative with good use of space, both indoor and outdoor; The development meets the current and future needs of the homeowner; and The design has wonderful design integrity and consideration of the surrounding streetscape. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The applicant welcomes these positive comments from the community.
<p>Comments Received in Objection:</p>	<p>Applicant Comment:</p>
<p><u>Street Setback</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The City of Vincent Newsletter No.64 Spring 2012 states that the upper floor should be setback at least 2.0m behind the ground floor; and The bulk of the house will still dominate the street with a compliant setback and detract from the Mt Hawthorn character, particularly as there is no other house on the street or in the locality that has the same bulk and mass; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This newsletter was written 7 years ago and since then the planning framework has changed. The street setback is compliant with the City's Built Form Policy.
<p><u>Height</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The height is not appropriate as it is out of character with the rest of the area and provides significant adverse visual impacts to the streetscape. The development appears too large and overbearing from the street; The rooftop terrace adds an additional storey, resulting in a three storey development. Three storeys is not in keeping with existing developments within the area; The additional height proposed is considered excessive, resulting in significant additional overshadowing, overlooking, and adverse visual impacts to neighbouring properties; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The height of the development is now compliant with the Residential Design Codes and sits lower than those houses with a pitched roof on the street. The stated "overshadowing, overlooking, and adverse visual impacts" is incorrect as the design addresses these items and is compliant in all aspects.

Summary of Submissions:

Comments Received in Objection:	Applicant Comment:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Additional height has adverse amenity impacts on surrounding properties, especially as the rooftop will be used as an active space; • The additional height results in lot boundary setback variations, particularly from the upper levels. Building this high should be setback further from the boundaries and reduced in size; • Trees on the rooftop terrace will further increase the height of the development. Concerns about how high the house will appear with trees on top; • Scale of the development is not suited to the land size, streetscape or locality. This size of development would be better suited in coastal suburbs or inner City; and • The third storey / additional height of the development will set an undesirable precedence for future developments. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The roof top is compliant with the height and overlooking requirements of the R Codes. • The height is now compliant with the R Codes. • The vegetation has been removed from the roof top. • This is an opinion and is subjective. • 'Undesirable precedent' is simply an opinion of a surrounding landowner and should not be considered as a valid planning reason.
<p><u>Lot Boundary Setbacks to Adjoining Properties</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Setbacks to the rear lot boundary have decreased in the amended plans, resulting in significant overlooking to the adjoining properties, adverse visual impacts and excessive noise; • Walls of the development do not engage with surrounding properties, and rather impose on them; • Reduced setbacks result from the house being too large for the land size; • The design of the development does not relate to the surrounding properties and therefore appears out of character; • The proposal does little to mitigate its significant reduction of the rear setback standards, resulting in bulk and mass to the rear properties, reduction in sunlight and increased overlooking. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The rear setbacks and privacy requirements are compliant with the R Codes. Furthermore, any impacts of noise are covered in the Health Legislation. • This comment is not clear? • The lot boundary setbacks of the are either compliant with the deemed-to-comply requirement or a considered to address the design principles of the R Codes. • The existing dwellings in the streetscape are inconsistent in their design and therefore there is no established streetscape in this prtion f Kalgoorlie Street.
<p><u>Boundary Walls to Adjoining Properties</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Boundary walls are too high and too close to the adjoining properties providing visual bulk to the southern property; • Boundary walls are only on the verge of compliance; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed boundary walls comply with the deemed-to-comply requirements of the R Codes and City's Policies.
<p><u>Street Surveillance</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The house has no windows facing the street, and subsequently makes no effort to relate to the streetscape and Mount Hawthorn community; and • The studio window facing the street is covered by trees. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New iterations of the plans show a clear front door of 1.5m wide. A new window to the study has been added and a clear garage door for increased surveillance. Also, the master bedroom has been re-designed and the brick openings with glass backing have been

Summary of Submissions:

Comments Received in Objection:	Applicant Comment:
	<p>changed to the master bedroom side to increase surveillance. There is also a roof terrace/balcony to the front which has some surveillance.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Landscaping has been changed, although when we progress to building application phase we will obtain a full landscaping plan. New designs show different landscaping to increase surveillance.
<p><u>Street Walls and Fences</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The front gate slides externally, creating potential safety issues for pedestrians walking past. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposal is compliant with the deemed-to-comply street walls and fences requirements of the City's Polocies.
<p><u>Garage Setback</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The garage should be 0.5m behind the house to comply with the R Codes. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The setback of the garage complies with the deemed-to-comply requirements of the City's Polices.
<p><u>Landscaping</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The existing greenery within Mount Hawthorn is what makes the suburb so desirable. The development should achieve the full 15% required landscaping to contribute to vegetation in Mount Hawthorn; The accuracy of the 12.6% calculation is questioned; The development proposes deep soil areas where amenities are located, do these contribute to the calculation? Concerns that deep soil zones may be provided with astro-turf; Trees provided to the south of the lot will be in constant shade; Reduced landscaping will result in an urban heat island effect; Concerns relating to inconsistencies in landscaping between plans, as trees are shown in different locations between plans, and in locations where trees could not be accommodated (e.g the driveway). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It has been consented with the council that at Building Application phase a landscaping plan will be submitted with 30% canopy coverage.
<p><u>Visual Privacy</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development provides major visual intrusions to neighbouring properties from the windows and terraces proposed; The rooftop terrace will cause considerable overlooking to all adjoining properties, particularly as it is so high. The overlooking from the rooftop terrace falls onto back gardens of the adjoining properties, resulting in major privacy concerns. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All privacy and overlooking requirements are compliant with the requirements of the R Codes.

Summary of Submissions:

Comments Received in Objection:	Applicant Comment:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The rooftop terrace should be setback 7.5m from all lot boundaries so as to reduce all overlooking and subsequent loss of privacy to all properties; • Rear external stairs are not screened and are too close to lot boundaries therefore providing considerable overlooking to backyards of the adjoining properties. The rear stairs should be screened; • Concerns relating to overlooking from upper floor doorways that are not glazed; • The terrace above the garage is not screened to the front, resulting in overlooking to the northern adjoining property; and • Overlooking if supported will set an undesirable precedence for future development. 	
<p><u>Solar Access</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The additional height and reduced lot boundary setbacks of the development results in a loss of natural sunlight to the adjoining properties; • If the southern property were subdivided, overshadowing would be a lot more significant; • Wall heights, lengths, setbacks and roof design should be modified to reduce overshadowing to the south; and • The solar access diagram provided by the applicant does not show the shadow from the rooftop terrace. The solar access diagram as provided from the applicant should be checked as it does not appear to be compliant. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal is compliant with the deemed-to-comply overshadowing requirements of the R Codes.
<p><u>Access and Parking</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The development may result in additional traffic and subsequent safety issues; and • The number of bedrooms proposed will increase occupants and subsequent parking required. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal is compliant with the deemed-to-comply parking requirements of the R Codes.
<p><u>Heritage</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The development will have an adverse impact the heritage character of the locality. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no heritage of the surrounding properties on Kalgoorlie street and the existing house isn't a heritage listed property.
<p><u>Noise</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noise will travel from the rooftop terrace through the whole suburb given it is on the top level; • Concerns relating to noise generated from people walking up and down the external stairs; and 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noise is a health act issue not a planning issue. This comment is based on assumption to what we will use the roof garden for.

Summary of Submissions:

Comments Received in Objection:	Applicant Comment:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The outdoor shower is on the boundary and will create noise issues to the adjoining properties. 	
<p><u>Built Form Outcome</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The design of the development does not fit into or complement the streetscape. There are no houses along this street or in the surrounding locality that are similar to this design or are of this scale and mass; The development is not in keeping with Mount Hawthorn character homes; The façade of the development does not promote a sense of community and instead turns its back on the street and community. The design is counter to neighbourly interaction; The development has not been designed to engage with surrounding properties; There is too much white concrete, which does not relate to the streetscape and detracts from the character homes in Mount Hawthorn; The development would be better located in another suburb where there are similar residences and streetscapes that it would fit into; Roof top terraces are completely out of character in Mt Hawthorn. The terrace will be damaging to neighbours; and The design will provide an undesirable precedence to future developments within the locality. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> These are simply opinions of surrounding landowners and should not be considered as a valid planning reason.
<p><u>Other</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The development will alienate surrounding properties; The development does not need the amount of amenities it has proposed and should be reduced in size (e.g. number of bedrooms, bathrooms, BBQ areas, gym, sauna etc); Concerns relating to how smells, gasses and steam released from the sauna will be addressed; Concerns relating to how waste water from the outdoor shower will be drained; The plans do not show the rooftop terrace on the front elevation; The development will reduce property values; and Development does not comply with the Mount Hawthorn Precinct Policy. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> These are simply opinions of surrounding landowners and should not be considered as a valid planning reason.