

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.

Comments Received in Objection:	Officer Technical Comment:
<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; • The height would have adverse impacts on the adjoining properties in terms of building bulk and overshadowing; and • The height is not consistent with the street. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed building height meets the deemed-to-comply standards of the Built Form Policy Clause 5.6 Building Height; and • The compliant building height alleviates impacts of building bulk, overshadowing and subsequent amenity impacts to the street and adjoining properties.
<p><u>Street Setbacks</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposed street setbacks do not fit into the existing streetscape. The development appears out of character; • Adverse impacts to the amenity of the streetscape; • The reduced street setback results in overshadowing to the adjoining properties; and • Development protrudes too far forward of adjoining properties, appearing dominant in the street. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The street setback of the adjoining properties varies between from 5.5 metres to 20.5 metres. The property with a street setback of 20.5 metres is an anomaly and substantially increases the average street setback. The average setback of the adjoining properties would be 7.45 metres if the property with a 20.5 metre setback was excluded from the calculation. The established streetscape provides inconsistent setbacks due to a mix in typology of developments along the street; • The setback provided is consistent with the immediately abutting development to the south of the subject site. The proposed development sits in line with the southern properties porch and building line, reducing the dominance of the building when viewed from the street; • The development provides balconies and large windows facing Stirling Street that assist in reducing the prominence of the solid blank walls and adds detail and articulation in the façade, assisting in moderating the impact of the building bulk and scale. The contrasting materials and colours respond to the existing developments along Stirling Street and within the broader Highgate area. Comments received by the DRP confirm that the development responds to the local context well and that the Architectural language is strong.
<p><u>Lot boundary setbacks and lot boundary walls</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The 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; • The building is too close to adjoining properties, results in a feeling of claustrophobia to adjoining properties; • Setbacks encroach onto safety of adjoining properties; • Development is too high and should be reduced to a maximum of two 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Following neighbour consultation the applicant submitted amended plans reducing the lengths and heights of walls on the boundary. The amended plans also provided greater setbacks to adjoining properties as well as additional design detail to walls in effort to alleviate any adverse impacts to adjoining properties; • The northern and southern elevations provide articulation to wall lengths, wall heights and provide openings that breaks up solid portions of blank wall and subsequently reduces building bulk when viewed from the southern adjoining property. The elevations also provide a range of

Summary of Submissions:

Comments Received in Objection:	Officer Technical Comment:
<p>storeys;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Setbacks and boundary walls result in a loss of direct sunlight to adjoining properties; and • Setbacks and boundary walls provide adverse visual impacts and building bulk to adjoining properties, particularly to habitable rooms and outdoor living areas of adjoining properties. 	<p>colours and materials that add design detail and subsequently reducing building bulk impacts to the adjoining properties;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The walls with reduced setback meets the deemed-to-comply standards of the R Codes Clause 5.4.1 Visual Privacy, ensuring no adverse overlooking and subsequent loss of privacy to the adjoining properties; • The development does not result in a reduction of solar access to the adjoining northern and western properties; • The shadow projection to the southern adjoining property does not fall across major openings or the rear outdoor living area of the property. The shadow diagrams, included in Attachment 2, demonstrate that the solar panels on the southern property are largely unaffected by the proposed development, and receive direct sunlight for the majority of the year. The building has been stepped back to allow for ventilation to flow; and • The reduction in boundary wall heights and lengths is considered to largely alleviate impacts of building bulk to the adjoining properties. All boundary walls now meet the deemed-to-comply standards in terms of height.
<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 would further congest these streets and worsen parking within the area; • Development would increase demand for on-street parking; • Parking reductions will reduce the amenity and liveability for local residents; and • Street parking arrangements (similar to Mary St) should be introduced. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The development provides one on-site resident bay per apartment which meets the deemed-to-comply standards of Clause 6.3.3 Parking. The site also provides one bay for the use of visitors to the site. The parking provided on site for residents and visitors is suitable; • The car parking provision is appropriate to this location given the site is within an area that's highly walkable and has good public transport and cycle networks. The site is also within close proximity to employment centres including Mount Lawley, Northbridge, Perth, East Perth and Leederville and within an area that accommodates on-street parking options; and • The design and location of car parking provided minimises negative visual and environmental impacts on the developments amenity and the streetscape; and • Car parking has been designed to be safe and accessible.
<p><u>Landscaping</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The development should comply with the deep soil and canopy cover requirements; • The development does not positively contribute to vegetation cover within Highgate; • Lack of canopy cover is not consistent with the locality and affects the amenity of surrounding properties. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Following neighbour consultation the applicant submitted amended plans with increased deep soil zones. The amended proposal included 11% deep soil zones, as well as additional landscaping areas on site that does not contribute to deep soil. The provision of landscaping within the front setback, rear setback and along all lot boundaries is considered to reduce the overall impact of the development to the street and adjoining

Summary of Submissions:

Comments Received in Objection:	Officer Technical Comment:
	<p>properties. The retention of existing trees as well as the range of species proposed would soften the building edge and provide sufficient shading and greenery on site. The landscaping provided as part of this application is consistent with the Highgate locality; and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The development provides 31.5 percent canopy cover within the deep soil zones provided on site. Trees retained on site contribute to approximately one third (31.1 percent) of the proposed canopy cover. The canopy cover proposed provides great landscaping amenity for the residents and the community and further reduces the impact of the development on adjoining residential lots, creating a sense of open space between dwellings.
<p><u>Sightlines</u></p> <p>Safety issues resulting from the reduced sightlines provided.</p>	<p>The applicant has submitted a Traffic Safety Report with the application, included in Attachment 7, which has reviewed and provided recommendations for the access arrangement proposed. The Traffic Safety Report concludes that the driveway would maintain sufficient sightlines where it intersects with the adjacent footpath to ensure visibility and safety, subject to the driveway being set off the boundary 0.5 metres and a watch for pedestrians sign being provided on-site. The application has incorporated these recommendations into the proposed plans. The City's Technical Officers have reviewed the Safety Report and support the proposal.</p>
<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 major openings. The development results in loss of privacy to adjoining properties; and • Provision of privacy screens to all balconies result in the development being uninhabitable for future residents. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Following neighbour consultation the applicant submitted amended plans reducing overlooking to adjoining properties. • The development meets the deemed-to-comply standards in regards to overlooking to the adjoining northern properties; • The development does not adversely impacts the adjoining southern properties in terms of loss of privacy as the orientation and design of buildings, windows and balconies have been designed to minimise direct overlooking of habitable rooms and private outdoor living areas to the southern adjoining properties; and • The balconies provided have not been entirely screened, and maintain daylight, solar access and ventilation to the dwellings. The balconies are useable and enhance residential amenity.

Summary of Submissions:

Comments Received in Objection:	Officer Technical Comment:
<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; and • Shadows would adversely impact the southern properties habitable rooms, outdoor spaces and solar panels; and • Wall heights, lengths, setbacks and roof design should be modified to reduce overshadowing to the south. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The deemed-to-comply standards of R Codes Clause 6.4.2 Solar access for adjoining sites do not apply to sites with R80 coding; • Following neighbour consultation the applicant submitted amended plans reducing boundary wall heights and lengths, and increasing lot boundary setbacks. The changes reduced the amount of shadowing to the southern adjoining properties; and • The shadow diagrams, included in Attachment 2, demonstrate that the solar panels and outdoor living areas on the southern properties are largely unaffected by the proposed development, and receive direct sunlight for the majority of the year. The building has been articulated and stepped back to allow for ventilation to flow.
<p><u>Noise</u></p> <p>Noise from air-conditioning units would provide adverse impacts to adjoining properties. This would be a nuisance for surrounding residents.</p>	<p>The development would be subject to compliance with the <i>Environmental Protection (Noise) Regulations 1997</i>.</p>
<p><u>Overall development and general comments</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development decreases liveability for local residents; • Development is not consistent with R80 provisions. Variations are excessive, particularly the wall height and cone of vision; • The development would detrimentally impact the visual amenity of the area; • 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; • Development would set an undesirable precedent for further similar development; • Development should better deflect the character homes and existing character in the Highgate locality; and • Design results in a loss of character within Highgate. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Following neighbour consultation the applicant submitted amended plans that reduced the amount of deemed-to-comply variations on site. Subsequently, the amended plans have reduced any adverse impacts to the adjoining properties and the street; • The development is of a high quality and the style of the development is compatible with the streetscape and Highgate locality; • Comments received by the DRP confirm that the development responds to the local context well and that the Architectural language is strong; • The design of the development is be consistent with the locality, and the proposal would contribute to and enhance the established streetscape; and • The site is not located within a Heritage or Character Retention Area.

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