

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.

Total number of submissions received: 15

Total number of objections received: 9

Total number of support submissions received: 4

Total number of submissions that neither objected nor supported: 2

Neighbour comments received summary:	Applicant Response:
<p><u>Building Height:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Development is too high and should be reduced to a maximum of two storeys.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The Highgate area east of Beaufort Street has been an R80 zoning since the property was purchased by the applicant in 2014. In accordance with the R-Codes this zoning allows developments to be constructed up to three stories. In the last couple of years the City of Vincent has increased the height limit in this area from two stories to three stories as part of the new Built Form Policy, bringing it in line with the R-Codes. The development is therefore compliant with the allowable building height. The applicant has noted several existing three storey developments already in the area (as listed in the second last response under the general comments) and expects future developments in the direct vicinity to also be constructed to three stories or greater, particularly as it is an older area. In addition the Stirling Towers proposed development directly across the street is understood to comprise of buildings to a minimum of three stories and much greater.• Further, although the development is 3 stories, the applicant has taken considerable steps to minimise the height of the development to retain heights along similar lines to the adjoining properties. These steps include removing 0.4m from the current finished ground level of the existing site to lower the overall height of the development. The highest point of the development to the rear of the site is only 1.2m higher than the adjoining neighbours 2 storey detached house roof line.

Summary of Submissions:

<p><u>Street setbacks:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Proposed street setbacks do not fit into the existing streetscape – do not look right • Development protrudes too far forward of adjoining properties.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• This comment has been taken into consideration and the front setback from the street will be increased uniformly by 3.0m to better fit into the existing streetscape. The development now provides a minimum setback of 6.0m to the closest balcony corner which rakes back to 7.5m at the Southern Edge. The balcony now sits back behind the adjoining neighbour's carport at 349 Stirling Street.• In addition to the previous bullet point, the taper on the balconies will be maintained to allow a visual transition from the corner property to the north of the development (97 Broome Street, which has a side wall built close to Stirling Street boundary) to the existing house on south of the development (349 Stirling Street).
<p><u>Lot boundary setbacks and lot boundary walls:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Reduced lot boundary setbacks and boundary wall heights decrease local amenity• Boundary walls are over length and over height• Setbacks result in overlooking to habitable rooms and outdoor living areas of adjoining properties. Direct overlooking proposed. • Buildings are too close to adjoining properties, results in a feeling of claustrophobia to adjoining properties that face onto the walls.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Amendments have been made to the lot boundary setbacks and boundary wall heights to reduce the impact on the local amenity.• The boundary wall lengths have been reduced in length and in height far under the allowable provisions of an R80 development site to better accommodate adjacent amenity.• Refer to the response provided for visual privacy which addresses this concern. Overlooking has been addressed appropriately and in accord with the provisions of the planning codes.• The apartments have been set-back 3m from adjoining houses (to the south by way of the battle-axe driveway) with the exception of two small wings to the North of the development with are 1.5m from the boundary. These reduced setback elements are located such that no windows will provide any overlooking into adjoining rear outdoor living areas.• For the rear apartment building, one length of wall is to be built alongside an existing two storey parapet to the South and has been located such that the solid elements (bedroom and balcony store) are located adjoining existing store rooms on ground to Broome Street townhouses, with the significant

Summary of Submissions:

<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Setbacks encroach onto safety of adjoining properties.• Development is too high and should be reduced to a maximum of two storeys.• Setbacks and boundary walls result in a loss of direct sunlight to adjoining properties.• Setbacks and boundary walls provide visual pollution and building bulk to adjoining properties, particularly to habitable rooms and outdoor living areas of adjoining properties.• Concerns relating to the proposed height of the boundary walls. Will provide adverse visual impacts to adjoining properties courtyard and bedroom windows due to the excessive height and length proposed.• Design will affect the enjoyment / lifestyle of living within a residential area. Walls provide a claustrophobia appeal to the adjoining courtyards. Significant adverse effect to adjoining properties.	<p>extent of visual outlook from both affected Broome Street townhouses overlooking our proposed stairwell screen which is to be planted with a flowering creeping plant which will provide 2 storeys of flowering greenery as the new outlook for these residents. Additionally we are significantly vegetating the rear communal garden and the carparking area with Bamboo screening and large trees as well as retaining the existing 50 year old Olive Tree at the N-W corner of the site. The overall impact of the development will provide greater landscaped outlook than currently exists on site.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The safety of the adjoining properties will not be compromised by the setbacks of the development. The development will comply with the relevant Australian Standards and Building Code of Australia ensuring safety is provided.• Refer to the response provided for buildings height which addresses this matter.• Overshadowing diagrams have been provided illustrating that there is zero overshadowing impact on the properties along Broome Street, and that the only shadow onto 349/349A occurs to the battle-axe driveway, a small 1m2 area to the rear courtyard of 349A and to less than 50% of the area of solar panels to the roof of 349 Stirling. Further, this shadow impact only occurs on the 21st of June. All other times of the year have a net effect nil overshadowing. No outdoor amenity has been compromised to the adjoining properties.• The development has been separated into two separate buildings (which costs more to construct than a single building of the same total size) to maintain outlook, cross ventilation due to breezes, and solar access between the apartment buildings and for the benefit/consideration of all adjoining residents. Further, splitting the apartment buildings has allowed for the significant planting around the development which will maintain outlook for residents from their outdoor habitable areas, and bedrooms.
--	--

Summary of Submissions:

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The plans for the upper levels have been modified to reduce the impact and building bulk of the development. This visual impact has been reduced by these amendments. In addition windows will be made opaque to prevent overlooking in both directions.• An effort has been made by the applicant to articulate the walls to provide variations of material and also a plant wall on the northern stairs of the rear building. This has been done to reduce the impact on the adjoining properties and courtyards.
<p><u>Parking and Traffic:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Stirling Street and Broome Street are already congested and overcrowded streets and already have limited parking already from visitors. Development will further congest these streets and worsen parking within the area. • Development will increase demand for on-street parking • Street parking arrangements (similar to Mary St) should be introduced	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• This comment is noted and as a resident of the area the applicant has endeavoured that the development does not result in a loss of street parking. This has been achieved by maintaining the same driveway and cross over so the existing street bay in front of 351 Stirling Street is not compromised. This differs from the neighbouring property at 349 Stirling Street which has used the entire frontage as a crossover to create a rear battle-axe development with 2 car bays side by side at the front of their property. • Due to the location of the development being in a high walk score location (94 out of 100) and comprising of a combination of 1 and 2 bedroom small to medium size apartments, it is not expected that demand for on street parking would increase as residents only need to own one vehicle and/or a bicycle and visitors can catch public transport, cycle or walk. • This would be for the City of Vincent to consider, but the applicant is not supportive of this approach as the northern end of Stirling Street (close to where the development is located) has a dead end at Harold Street and therefore this section of road has lower traffic volumes and is not used as a thoroughfare unlike Mary Street which is between the busy Beaufort and William Streets.

Summary of Submissions:

<p><u>Visual Privacy:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerns relating to direct overlooking to backyards and habitable room windows from proposed balcony and windows. Development results in loss of privacy to adjoining properties. Provision of privacy screens to all balconies result in the development being uninhabitable for future residents. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Amendments have been made to the plans to address all overlooking issues which will maintain the privacy of the adjoining properties and the future residents of the development. Privacy screens are only used on the sides of the balconies where required for overlooking, each balcony contains at least one open unscreened section resulting in a beneficial outdoor space.
<p><u>Design:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development should better deflect the character homes and existing character in the Highgate locality Design results in a loss of character within Highgate 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Highgate locality contains a mixture of character homes, new developments and older unit developments devoid of character. The extent of genuine character period homes on the eastern side of Beaufort Street are less than the Western side of Beaufort Street. This is best reflected by a recent rule introduced by the City of Vincent that smaller R80 lots have been rezoned down to R60 to prevent development of these character homes, this is certainly not the case on the Eastern side of Beaufort Street where height limits have increased encouraging development. Highgate is an eclectic area due to its close proximity to the city. The development reflects the demands of affordable inner city living with a modern feel which in the applicant's opinions compliments the character homes and the diversity in the area.
<p><u>Noise:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noise from air-conditioning units will provide adverse impacts to adjoining properties. Will be a nuisance for surrounding residents. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The apartment living spaces are small to medium in size and have been orientated to take advantage of passive solar design. It is not expected that the demand for air-conditioning will be high. The location and position of the air-conditioning units per apartment will be considered in the next stage of design and noise impacts to adjoining properties will be a design input at this stage.
<p><u>Overall development and general comments:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development decreases liability for local residents Development is not consistent with R80 provisions. Variations are excessive, particularly the wall height and cone of vision. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Disagree. The development will not have an impact on the liability of local residents. Disagree. The development is consistent with the R80 provisions. The development is under the maximum height allowed for R80 (10m which is less than 12m), the

Summary of Submissions:

<p>Variations will detrimentally impact the visual amenity of the area. Not the right type of density for the area.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Lots should be amalgamated in order to achieve the intended development.• Development appears to be an attempt to maximise financial return for the applicant rather than have any ongoing interest for the community.	<p>development is less than the maximum plot ratio allowed for R80 (0.79 instead of 1.0), the development contains a greater street setback than allowed in R80 (now 6.0m minimum instead of 2m). In regards to side boundary setbacks and wall heights, these have been reduced and in regards to the visual amenity and the impact of bulking has been reduced by the amendments to the plans outlined. This is the type of density that this area requires, else it would not be R80. The block is long and not suited to anything else other than a battle-axe development which would create undesirable houses that feel separated from the streetscape and dominated by long driveways with concrete hardscaping with very little vegetation and amenity.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• This is a valid point, but unfortunately the owner of 349 Stirling Street chose to develop a similar narrow lot with a rear battle-axe development. In essence if this adjacent site was not developed than a 1240m² amalgamated lot could have been created. However the opposite argument is that being an R80 site this would have allowed a development to include a far great number of apartments (up to 20) and the developer may have pushed for a greater number of stories as a result which would be undesirable. Other owners surrounding the site, including the Broome Street townhouses have already developed as well ruling out any possibility of amalgamation.• Solely attempting to maximise financial return is untrue. The development has to be viable enough for the project to be economical else funding will not be able to be sought which is necessary for the next stage (i.e. building licence and construction). The applicant has a direct interest in the community having lived at the existing house for a number of years since purchasing the property and the applicant is also planning on retaining an apartment dwelling to live in after the project is complete. Although the applicant is the property owner the construction of the development is planned to be
---	---

Summary of Submissions:

<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Development will set an undesirable precedent for further similar development. • Development is the wrong type of density.	<p>undertaken as a syndicate with four to five people who live locally, all with a skill to offer the development (engineering, architecture and accountant etc.) and all looking to retain an apartment. The existing house was originally purchased by the applicant to live in, however it is in poor condition and has undergone several distasteful renovations making not viable to retain.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• This is not the first type of development in the direct vicinity, so it will be not setting a precedent as there are other developments the same size on similar size lots. Examples of similar developments are as follows:<ul style="list-style-type: none">- <i>110 Broome Street, Highgate (9 no. 2 bedroom by 1 bathroom apartments on a similar 630m2 site, 3 storey building, maxing out the plot ratio at 1:1 for R80, constructed less than 10 years ago).</i>- <i>124 Wright Street, Highgate (6 no. 1 bedroom by 1 bathroom townhouses on 552m2 site, 2 storey building, recently constructed).</i>• The article below was written in the West Australian just over a week ago encouraging this exact type of density. If Perth is to grow as a viable city and maintain its liveability then the CBD and inner suburbs need to increase their population rather than a continuation of the urban sprawl. Please take the time to read this article. The applicant is of the view along with others in the area (at least the 4 out of the 15 who responded) who showed support of this development also agree with this type of density being beneficial to the local businesses and community. It is likely that some of the 9 who did not show support plus the 2 who neither supported nor objected are also of the same opinion that medium density developments are crucial in Perth. However they are concerned about the direct impact of this development to their property which governed their design to not support. This is understandable and has been a conscious design intent to
---	--

Summary of Submissions:

	<p>reduce the impact on these neighbouring properties from the outset of the design and we hope to better this outcome with the amended plans and consideration of their comments with these responses.</p> <p>https://thewest.com.au/business/commercial-property/resistance-site-size-hurdles-for-medium-density-uptake-ng-b881016356z</p>
--	--