

## Summary of Submissions:

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

Comments Received in Objection:	Administration Comment:
<p><u>Lot Boundary Walls</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lot boundary wall extends along the boundary for 16.59 metres, an increase from previous applications. Boundary wall does not comply with Residential Design Code Clause 5.1.3 Lot Boundary Setbacks and C3.2iii as development extends to the lot boundary on two sides.</li> <li>• Landscaping and active habitable spaces to neighbouring properties will be severely impacted by the lot boundary walls.</li> <li>• Plans include a significant southern boundary wall due to the move away from a "mirrored" arrangement. This requires a compliance compromise in order to enable a dwelling of this size to be built on a small block.</li> </ul>	<p>The City's Built Form Policy Clause 5.2 amends Clause 5.1.3 and C3.2iii to allow lot boundary walls to two side boundaries that are permitted up to two-thirds the length of the lot boundaries behind the front setback, being 22.08 metres in length permitted for each of the boundary walls. The application proposes two boundary walls that are 6.0 metres (garage wall) and 18.0 metres (portico to kitchen) in length. This satisfies the deemed-to-comply number and length of walls permitted. The cumulative length of the two boundary walls would be far lesser than that permitted under the Built Form Policy.</p>
<p><u>Landscaping</u></p> <p>Proposed canopy cover value quoted is questioned, as it is derived from full-canopy trees which are unlikely to become established in the small spaces.</p>	<p>Trees are proposed to be planted in consolidated deep soil areas, with areas accommodating tree planting a minimum of 2 metres in dimension. This is greater than the minimum dimension for deep soil planting areas which is 1 metre. The trees would be capable of growing to a greater height and canopy than that shown on the development plans. The City's Parks and Urban Greening team has reviewed the proposal and confirmed the tree species and their location would enable canopy to grow to full maturity.</p>
<p><u>Construction Management</u></p> <p>Simultaneous construction of both No. 48 and No. 48A Egina Street will create significant traffic hazards on a street and will present accessibility issues for all neighbouring residents due to trade vehicles no doubt blocking verges around the site. Proposal should be subject to a detailed and enforced management plan.</p>	<p>A condition requiring a construction management plan to be prepared, submitted to and approved by the City prior to issue of a building permit has been included as a recommended condition of approval. This is because the site has limited street frontage due to its narrow 7.6 metre lot width, and may be undertaken simultaneously with the development proposed on the adjoining property. A construction management plan would ensure effective management of building work and on-site construction, particularly waste management, storage of construction materials, parking arrangements for contractors and subcontractors, and traffic and access management to minimise disruption to and impact on the surrounding area. Obstruction to the street, verge and footpath during construction of the proposed dwelling is not permitted.</p>

**Summary of Submissions:**

Comments Received in Objection:	Administration Comment:
<p><u>Lot Configuration and Built Form Outcomes</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Development will set the precedent for what could be developed on Egina Street in the future. The land owner has created some of the smallest lots in Mount Hawthorn and then shoe horned in a much building area onto the lot as they can.</li> <li>Concerns that the dwellings with an appearance that is bulky and ugly that are out of keeping with the rest of the streetscape are being considered.</li> <li>Development does not enhance or contribute to the current streetscapes of the Mount Hawthorn area. City of Vincent should remain committed to preserving the heritage look of this suburb.</li> <li>As has been highlighted in the multiple previous submissions made (and rejected) for the proposed redevelopment, the revised plans still represent a loss of visual amenity in the street as the result of the bulk of the proposed dwelling onto a minimum sized block. Dwelling is only enabled by compromising on "deemed-to-comply" requirements, and the result will remain a frontage dominated by driveways, garage doors, and brickwork, against a street characterised by front yards and gardens.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The creation of the 307 square metre lot is as a result of subdivision lodged with and approved by the Western Australian Planning Commission (WAPC), consistent with the average and minimum lot sizes prescribed by the R Codes. The proposal would provide for 49.7 percent open space area which complies with the deemed-to-comply requirements of at least 45 percent prescribed under the R Codes. Together with landscaping areas and building setbacks provided, this does not indicate an overdevelopment of the site. The development is consistent with the planning framework setting.</li> <li>The application has been referred to a member of the City's Design Review Panel to ensure the proposed development would be complimentary to and would reference the established Egina Street streetscape. Comments and recommendations provided by the DRP member were implemented in amended plans prepared by the applicant. An urban design study prepared by the applicant and a streetscape analysis undertaken by the City has also formed part of the assessment of the proposed development. The built form, colours and materials of the dwelling would appropriately reference the established streetscape and broader locality, and is acceptable based on the applicable planning framework. It is noted that Egina Street is not located in a heritage precinct or character retention area.</li> <li>The proposed single garage and driveway that reduces to 3.0 metres in width at the front boundary, in lieu of the 6 metres deemed-to-comply standard, would reduce the appearance of vehicle access points to the streetscape and increases landscaping opportunities (both canopy and deep soil zones) in the front setback area. The urban design study submitted by the applicant demonstrates how the dwelling draws upon local built form references, supported by the comments and recommendations from the DRP member.</li> </ul>

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