

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 Objection: | Administration's Comments: |
|--|---|
| <p><u>Parking</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Currently limited parking surrounding the subject site. • Surrounding area already struggles with the demand of the commercial uses, in relation to traffic and parking. • Concern the development will exacerbate the issue. • Concern visitors will use other private car parking areas. • Concern relating to traffic and parking implications during construction. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The development proposes two car bays for the commercial component and two dedicated resident bays and one dedicated visitor parking bay for the residential component. The development meets the minimum car parking requirements set out in the City's Policy No. 7.7.1 – Non-Residential Development Parking Requirements for the commercial component of the development and is consistent with the Element Objectives of the R Codes – Volume 2 with respect to resident and visitor car parking. There is also the opportunity for the two dedicated commercial bays to be used by visitors to the residential dwellings out of hours. The provision of parking for the development is appropriate to the size and scale of the development, and having regard to the highly connected location. The development would not negatively impact on the accessibility of car parking in the locality, including private car parking areas. • Should the application be approved, a condition requiring a Construction Management Plan is recommended, to ensure that construction parking and traffic is suitably managed so as to not impact on the surrounding properties. |
| <p><u>Size & Scale</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Height, bulk and scale does not reflect the existing character of Charles Street. • Proposal is too bulky for the subject site. • Will result in a detrimental impact on the adjacent residential properties. • Three stories facing Lawler Street does not reflect permitted height to the eastern side of Lawler Street, should be more sympathetic. • Should meet street setback requirements. | <p>Following community consultation, the applicant submitted amended plans which reduced the height of the development from three storeys to two storeys, reduced the number of dwellings from three dwellings to two dwellings and increased lot boundary setbacks to provide more landscaping opportunities. The plot ratio and building height now satisfy the prescribed deemed-to-comply standards as outlined in the City's Built Form Policy and the Acceptable Outcomes/Element Objectives of the R Codes – Volume 2. The building height and setbacks satisfies the objectives of the elements relating to the primary controls of the R Codes – Volume 2 for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The building height reflects the existing development within the Charles Street streetscape and is consistent with the height limit identified for the site under the Built Form Policy. Although there is overshadowing to the solar panels and one major opening on each of the adjoining properties, this is unavoidable due to the orientation of the lots and has been mitigated through the building design; • The design incorporates a number of materials, colours and an articulated design, and an interactive ground floor design which mitigates the impact of building bulk and scale when viewed from the public realm; and |

Summary of Submissions:

| Comments Received in Objection: | Administration's Comments: |
|---|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The location of vegetation within the street setback areas and along the southern lot boundary provide a natural screening to mitigate the impact of the built form on the adjoining properties and when viewed from the public realm. |
| <p><u>Landscaping</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Should be more priority on the provision of landscaping on-site to reflect the character of the area. Any landscaping provision would create a better amenity for the area. Should be some consideration to the retention of existing vegetation on-site. | <p>Following community consultation, the applicant submitted amended plans which reduced the building footprint and provided more opportunities for landscaping on-site. The proposed landscaping includes the retention of mature vegetation and provides adequate amount of deep soil areas equating to 17 percent of the subject site area. The proposed canopy is located within the street setback area and along the southern wall of the commercial tenancies. The proposed landscaping satisfies the Element Objectives of the R Codes – Volume relating to landscaping. A standard condition of approval has been recommended for a revised landscaping plan to be provided which ensures that the proposed landscaping achieves the intended outcomes which will mitigate the impact of the development on the adjoining southern lot and when viewed from the street.</p> |
| <p><u>Building Design</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Building design does not reflect the character of the area. Applicant should demonstrate a sustainable design to consider the impact of the development on the environment. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Following community consultation, the applicant submitted amended plans which incorporates design elements, colours and materials that are more consistent with the Charles Street streetscape and broader North Perth locality. The application has been presented to the Design Review Panel (DRP) to consider the design of the development when considering the character of the locality. The DRP have provided comments that while the design has improved, further consideration could be given to the external appearance through the use of colours and materials. Administration has recommended a condition for a schedule of materials and colours to be submitted and approved by the City to ensure that the intended finish is sympathetic to the locality. A further condition for a revised landscaping plan to be submitted and approved by the City has also been recommended, to ensure that the species are appropriately selected to assist with mitigating the impact of the development. The proposal satisfies the Element Objectives of the R Codes – Volume 2 and the City's Built Form Policy with respect to environmentally sustainable design (ESD), as an ESD report has been submitted which identifies that the development could achieve a five star Greenstar rating based on the original proposal. A condition has been recommended which requires an updated ESD report to be submitted to demonstrate that this can be achieved for the current proposal. |

Summary of Submissions:

| Comments Received in Objection: | Administration's Comments: |
|---|--|
| <p><u>External Fixtures</u></p> <p>Location of auxiliary services, i.e. air conditioning units, gas systems, should be shown to consider the impact on neighbouring properties.</p> | <p>A standard condition of approval has been recommended requiring information be submitted relating to location of these auxiliary services, and adequate measures imposed to mitigate any impact on the adjoining southern property.</p> |

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