

## Summary of Submissions:

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

<b>Comments Received in Support:</b>	<b>Administration Comment:</b>
No comments provided in the two submissions of support.	No comment required.
<b>Comments Received in Objection:</b>	<b>Administration Comment:</b>
<u>Context and Character</u>  The proposed development does not fit within the established character context of the streetscape. Some suggestions were made to retain the existing federation character home or at least be reflective of this in built form.	Given the property is not subject to heritage listing, retention of the existing dwelling is not required. The development design has responded to the prevailing and immediate street setback context and has used staggered and stepped setbacks to upper levels, particularly the loft floor, to mitigate bulk and scale. Amendments to the plans after the community consultation period improved the architectural language in response to community submissions and comments from the City's Design Review Panel (DRP) chair, who is overall supportive of the character and context consideration in the design.
<u>Building Height</u>  The three storey building height is excessive for the site and area context, and is non-compliant.	The City's Built Form Policy is designed to be flexible to allow for additional building height should applicable objectives and design principles be satisfied. In this instance the loft floors have been located and designed to be discrete using setbacks as not to dominate and detract from the streetscape and adjoining properties. Whilst two storeys is specified for the area under the Built Form Policy, there are a number of established three storey dwellings of a similar form within 100 metres of the site.
<u>Overdevelopment</u>  <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The proposal is an overdevelopment of the site.</li><li>• Reduced setbacks and greater building height result in detrimental bulk impacts on adjoining properties.</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The site has a density code of R50 which allows for up to five grouped dwellings at the site, whereas only four dwellings are provided. Open space assessed across the site as a whole instead of individual dwelling sites results in open space of 41.9%, which is compatible with the density code expectation of 40%.</li><li>• Setbacks have been articulated across the development proposal using staggering and stepping to reduce continuous lengths of large and bulky walls. Numerous and varied openings and materials are also used across floors and elevations to reduce the bulk of walls.</li></ul>

**Summary of Submissions:**

<b>Comments Received in Objection:</b>	<b>Administration Comment:</b>
<p><u>Overshadowing</u></p> <p>Detrimental overshadowing impact, particularly on the dwellings to the south.</p>	<p>Total overshadowing of the adjoining site at midday winter solstice is 40.5% which is under the 50% permitted in accordance with Clause 5.4.2 – Solar Access for Adjoining Sites. The building height responds to its context with the loft mostly contained within the roof form along the southern elevation and provided with significant setbacks to the southern boundary to reduce overshadowing. Overshadowing from the highest loft walls, being dormer features inserted into the roof form, are comparable in impact to a development built to the permitted 7.0 metres wall height with a typical side setback of 1.5 metres as demonstrated in the supplementary information provided by the applicant.</p>
<p><u>Privacy</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Reduced visual privacy from overlooking, particularly from Residence 4 to the north into future dwelling kitchen and outdoor living area approved at No. 14 Florence Street and overlooking south towards No. 10 Florence Street dwellings.</li><li>• Reduced privacy of No. 16 Florence Street and dwellings fronting Janet Street.</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Due to the context and layout of established and approved development adjoining the site at No. 14 Florence Street, visual privacy is not detrimentally impacted. Overlooking to the south falls over vehicle access ways and is subject to an indirect view angle. Furthermore, trees proposed along the southern boundary at maturity will provide greater visual privacy in future.</li><li>• Overlooking to the north is across a vacant site with approval for eleven grouped dwellings. Due to the layout of this approved development, overlooking falls mostly on blank walls, future fences and a communal parking space, with any excess overlooking of active habitable spaces indirect and minimal in extent. The properties located on Janet Street are approximately 14 metres from the subject site and will be separated by future development, so visual privacy would not be impacted by the proposal.</li></ul>
<p><u>Traffic</u></p> <p>Increased traffic and parking congestion in the street.</p>	<p>The proposal provides two private car parking spaces for each dwelling and one communal visitor car parking space. The number of private car parking spaces is one greater than that required under the R Codes Volume 1. Considering the surplus in car parking the development should not result in vehicle congestion in the street.</p> <p>The density code of R50 allows for up to five dwellings at the site, therefore the amount of traffic generated by four dwellings is reasonably expected for the future development potential of the area. The Western Australian Planning Commissions Transport Impact Assessment Guidelines indicate that a development of this scale, being less than ten dwellings, would have a low impact on the surrounding road network.</p>

**Summary of Submissions:**

Comments Received in Objection:	Administration Comment:
<p><u>Visitor Parking</u></p> <p>Visitor parking in the front setback does not reflect predominate features of the streetscape character.</p>	<p>The location of the visitor bay is compliant with the R Codes Volume 1. Notwithstanding this, an analysis of the street context found car parking within the street setback is a predominate feature. Landscaping between the visitor bay and Unit 1 is required through the detailed landscape plan to soften the visual impact on this dwelling. Furthermore, sufficient landscaping is provided to soften with visual impact on Florence Street with four new trees provided within the street setback area.</p>
<p><u>Non-compliant development</u></p> <p>Proposed development doesn't comply and therefore should not be supported.</p>	<p>The applicable planning policies are intended to be applied flexibly opposed to rigid compliance with deemed-to-comply criteria provided design principles and objectives are satisfied. Deemed-to-comply criteria is the minimum applicable standards, where a development meets the 'deemed-to-comply' requirements this provides a straight forward pathway to approval.</p> <p>A proposal is required to demonstrate compliance with design principles and/or objectives where it does not satisfy the corresponding deemed-to-comply provisions, subject to the discretion of the delegated decision maker being the City of Vincent Council in this instance.</p>
<p><u>Sewer easement conflict</u></p> <p>The development appears to be directly built over a sewer easement.</p>	<p>As indicated on the development plans the sewer line is to be re-aligned with the works to be carried out and subject to Water Corporation approval.</p>
<p><u>Tree canopy overshadowing</u></p> <p>The proposed 'pyrus calleryana' trees along the southern boundary will contribute to loss of direct sunlight and create overshadowing.</p>	<p>The 'pyrus calleryana' tree is a deciduous species which will allow for light penetration through winter whilst providing shade across the southern vehicle access hardstand in summer to reduce the urban heat island effect.</p>

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