

Summary of Submissions – Amendment 4 to Local Planning Policy No. 7.5.15 – Character Retention and Heritage Areas

OVERALL SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS			
Support		24	
Objection		17	
Total Submissions		41	
Survey question - Which streets do you support being included in the guidelines?			
Which area did the submissions come from	No. of participants	Support	Objection
Owners from The Boulevarde – (Scarborough Beach Rd – Anzac Rd)	11	6	5
Owners from Kalgoorlie Street – (Ashby Street and Anzac Rd)	8	0	8
Owners from Buxton Street – (Anzac Rd – Britannia Rd)	1	0	1
Owners from Matlock Street – (Anzac Rd and Britannia Rd)	2	2	0
Submitters outside the Guideline Area	19	16	3

THEME : BULK AND SCALE	
Survey question: Do you think that the bulk and scale of new development should be consistent with existing houses in the street?	
Support	22
Object	11
Unsure	3

Issue/Comment Summary	Administration Response	Proposed modification (Attachment 4)
1. Support - Upper storey additions should be well setback to retain existing character of the street.	Noted.	No modification
2. Support - bulky two storey homes allowed under the City's current guidelines do not fit within the character of the street.	Noted.	No modification
3. Object - there is already a precedence of mixed dwelling bulk and scale which adds to the appeal of the street.	A review of the nominated streets identifies that the predominant character of Kalgoorlie Street, The Boulevarde and Matlock Street is representative of early 20th century streetscapes. Original façade detailing, scale and form of dwellings, roofscape and front setbacks result in relatively consistent character. There is minimal new development that is inconsistent with the prevailing character in terms of bulk and scale. In general, the streets have a consistent pattern of development reflective of a low scale traditional streetscape. The inclusion of these streets in the Guideline Area provides an opportunity to ensure that new development is reflective of the predominant streetscape character.	Modification 3

Summary of Submissions – Amendment 4 to Local Planning Policy No. 7.5.15 – Character Retention and Heritage Areas

Issue/Comment Summary	Administration Response	Proposed modification (Attachment 4)
4. Object - development should be left to the owner's choice within the City's standard guidelines.	<p>The proposed Guidelines replace or augment already existing planning provisions that ensure new development that is visible from the street has a positive regard to the bulk and scale of existing character homes and the prevailing pattern of development. The provisions extend only to the matters that were identified to be valuable to the community through the initial community workshop. All development not visible from the street will not be subject to the Guideline provisions.</p> <p>The Guidelines provide an opportunity for a proposal to be assessed on a performance basis against local housing objectives that ensure the prevailing character is respected, even where 'deemed-to-comply' outcomes are not met.</p>	Modification 2
5. Object - Buxton Street and Kalgoorlie Streets should not be subject to additional guidelines as the original character has already changed as a result of new development.	<p>The portion of Kalgoorlie Street included in the Guidelines has new development that is inconsistent with the draft provisions in terms of bulk and scale, however generally the bulk and scale of the street is consistent with a pattern of development that reflects the low scale, original single storey dwellings. The addition of Kalgoorlie Street in the Guidelines provides an opportunity to ensure that new development is reflective of the predominant streetscape.</p> <p>The portion of Buxton Street included in the Guidelines does represent a street in transition, with the recent development having moved away from the bulk, scale and form of the original character houses. On further review, it is considered that the City's Built Form Policy is adequate to address any proposals for development in this area.</p>	Modification 1
6. The provisions should apply to the whole street, not just single out small pockets.	Noted. Policy No. 7.5.15 – Character Retention Areas sets out a community led process that provides an opportunity for owners within all areas to nominate their streets to be considered for character retention. At this time, nominations have only been received from the subject streets. The City's Administration undertook consultation with a broader area of Mt Hawthorn, however due to lack of community buy-in it was decided to proceed with character retention in the nominated areas in the current amendment.	No modification

Summary of Submissions – Amendment 4 to Local Planning Policy No. 7.5.15 – Character Retention and Heritage Areas

THEME : STREET WALLS AND FENCES	
Do you support the provision for front fences to be low and visually permeable (open)?	
Support	24
Object	10
Unsure	2

Issue/Comment Summary	Administration Response	Proposed modification (Attachment 4)
7. Object in part – 1.8m is too high and not in keeping with the area.	In recognising the community sentiment and the intent to maintain low front fences that provide visual openness and potential for interaction, the draft Guidelines take a flexible approach to front fencing that seeks to avoid a 'one size fits all' approach by providing variation in Deemed to Comply provisions for height between of 1.2m – 1.8m and performance measures for proposals that don't meet the deemed to comply provisions	No modification
8. Object in part – 1.2m is too low for safety of young children.	Where security or safety may be of concern, fences of up to 1.8m are considered acceptable to meet the overall objective of maintaining the open character of street frontages.	No modification
9. Support in part – Fences don't need to be low and visually permeable, one or the other satisfies the desired outcome	Noted – where a proposed front fence is lower, less permeability is required.	No modification
10. Support - The provision is fully supported to retain the character of the area.	Noted.	No modification
11. Support - High fences are not visually appealing and limit community interaction and passive surveillance.	Noted	
12. Object - It should be left to the owners choice within standard guidelines.	Front fences in the Guideline Area are predominantly low or non-existent fencing within the front setback area which allows for visual openness and retains views to original dwellings. In this regard, the draft Guidelines seek to recognise community sentiment to maintain an open atmosphere of street frontage by ensuring front boundary fences are low and/or visually permeable.	No modification
13. Object - There is already a precedence of inconsistency in the street.	Noted – as above	No modification
14. Object - Buxton should not be included in the guidelines as there is already a precedence of inconsistency in the street.	The portion of Buxton Street included in the Guidelines does represent a street in transition, with the recent development having moved away from the bulk, scale and form of the original character houses.	Modification 1

Summary of Submissions – Amendment 4 to Local Planning Policy No. 7.5.15 – Character Retention and Heritage Areas

THEME: STREET SETBACKS	
Survey question: Do you support the proposed second storey setback provision?	
Support	17
Object	18
Unsure	1

Issue/Comment Summary	Administration Response	Proposed modification (Attachment 4)
15. Support - Second storey setbacks as proposed will ensure the character of the street is maintained.	Noted - Consistency in front setbacks are a significant factors contributing to the presentation of a building bulk from the street and the continuity of a streetscape.	Modification 5
16. Object - The proposed second storey setbacks significantly reduce the usable land area on small lots.	<p>There are many good examples within the Guideline Area of second storey development setback on lots of this size. In considering good design outcomes, it is recommended that C1.2 be amended to provide for a more tailored design approach where second storey development can be setback behind the main ridgeline when retaining the original dwelling. The modification seeks to meet the development objective of maintaining complementary scale and bulk that does not dominate the original character homes, while still maximising usable land area.</p> <p>Add a new clause C1.3 that relates to new dwelling development to ensure consistency of the streetscape.</p>	Modification 5
17. Objection – The proposed second storey setbacks will have a negative impact on overshadowing and overlooking.	Any proposed development will be required to comply with relevant overshadowing and visual privacy requirements of the R-Codes and the City's Planning Policy No. 7.1.1 – Built Form.	No modification
18. Support in part – The proposed second storey setback should apply only for second storey additions when the original character home is being retained. New two storey development should not be subject to the same setback requirements as it is costly and causes buildability issues.	Consistent setbacks for additions and new buildings is important to ensure that the scale and bulk of new development responds appropriately to the original dwellings and prevailing streetscape.	No modification
19. Support - There are many examples where second storey setbacks similar to those proposed in the draft Guidelines have worked well.	Noted.	Modification 5
20. Support in part - Second storey setbacks are supported but unobtrusive modernist additions at rear of house would be preferred to “box on top” faux heritage additions.	Noted – The guidelines do not require that new development mimic the original dwelling, but rather that they draw influence from the traditional materiality and streetscape character. New development may be more contemporary in nature outside of the area which is visible from the street.	No modification

Summary of Submissions – Amendment 4 to Local Planning Policy No. 7.5.15 – Character Retention and Heritage Areas

Issue/Comment Summary	Administration Response	Proposed modification (Attachment 4)
21. Object - There is has already been a precedence set with a mix of second storey setbacks within these streets in Kalgoorlie and Buxton Streets where reduced second storey setbacks do not impact the streetscape.	Noted – There is development with reduced second storey setbacks in the portion of Kalgoorlie Street included in the Guideline area, however the prevailing character of the street is consistent with original pattern of development comprising a single storey presentation. Buxton Street has a mix of setbacks as a result of significant new development.	Modification 1
22. Object - It should be left to the owners choice to build with reduced setbacks within the City's standard guidelines.	In recognising the community sentiment to maintain the bulk and scale of character dwellings, the Guidelines include provisions relating to second storey setbacks. The prevailing character of the Guideline Area have generally consistent setbacks that retain the low scale, single storey presentation to the street. In this regard, the Guidelines seek to maintain the prevailing street setbacks. The Guidelines provide an opportunity for a proposal to be assessed on a performance basis against local housing objectives that ensure the prevailing character is respected, even where 'deemed-to-comply' outcomes are not met.	Modification 3 and 5

Summary of Submissions – Amendment 4 to Local Planning Policy No. 7.5.15 – Character Retention and Heritage Areas

THEME : ROOF PITCH	
Survey question – Do you support the proposed roof pitch requirements?	
Support	20
Object	13
Unsure	3

Issue/Comment Summary	Administration Response	Proposed modification (Attachment 4)
23. Support - Pitched roofs to match the existing homes are an important element to protecting the character of the area.	Noted - Roof form and pitch are built form elements that can significantly alter the appearance and continuity of a streetscape. The predominant roof form in the Guideline Area is traditional pitched roofs.	No modification
24. Object - Choice should be left to the owners discretion of architectural style within standard guidelines.	The prevailing community sentiment from the workshop and submission supports roof pitches that match the existing form. The draft Guidelines seek to avoid inconsistent roof pitches for development viewed from the street by requiring that they respect the predominant form. Outside the area visible from the street, roof form and pitch requirements of the Guidelines will not apply.	Modification 2 and modification 10
25. Object - There is has already been a precedence set with a mix of roof pitches within these streets.	The prevailing character of the Guideline Area is traditional hipped or gabled pitched roof forms.	No modification
26. The roof pitch requirements limit the space available for solar power generation.	New development can incorporate solar design while meeting the roof pitch requirements.	No modification
27. Object – A mix of architectural styles add appeal to the street.	The Guidelines maintain roof pitches that are consistent with the prevailing development of the street which is traditional pitched roof forms. Areas outside those visible from the can develop outside the roof pitch requirements.	Modification 2
28. Low profile roof pitches to rear additions will maximise solar access for neighbours.	Rear additions outside the area that contribute to the established character when viewed from the street can develop outside the roof pitch requirements.	Modification 2

Summary of Submissions – Amendment 4 to Local Planning Policy No. 7.5.15 – Character Retention and Heritage Areas

THEME : BUILDING DESIGN	
Survey question - Do you support the inclusion of building design advice in the guidelines?	
Support	21
Object	15

Issue/Comment Summary	Administration Response	Proposed modification (Attachment 4)
29. Support - Context and site analysis can help to ensure the character of the area is continued through details such as window design, materials/colours and finished floor levels.	Noted. The Guidelines seek to ensure important character elements that contribute to a streetscape are considered in the context of new development.	No modification
30. Object - Outdated building design and the use of old style materials are not eco friendly. We should be able to build using materials that are suited to our climate.	Outside of the area visible from the street, building design controls in accordance with the Guidelines are not applicable and sustainable building materials and design is encouraged.	Modification 2
31. Object - The focus should be on quality architecture contemporary or otherwise and the consideration of setbacks.	Noted – The Guidelines seek to ensure a high standard of architectural and sustainable design solutions for new development and additions to existing development.	No modification
32. Object - Great design can be achieved through the use of different materials and colours. New development should not match the original house but should reflect the original houses in the area.	The guidelines take a flexible approach to new development and seek to avoid mimicking traditional character features. New dwellings can be more contemporary in nature, giving due consideration to traditional building forms and materials. The guidelines are considered to address the communities' feedback to allow for contemporary works whilst striking a balance to ensure that development still respects the existing character of an area.	No modification
33. Object - Original architectural styles built 100 years ago should not dictate today's guidelines.	Noted. As above.	No modification
34. Some of the existing character homes in Kalgoorlie Street are not good examples to model off.	Noted. It is not the intention of the Guidelines to stipulate that new development be modelled off poor design examples, but rather that they respond appropriately to the surrounding streetscapes built form elements.	No modification
35. The gradient of the streets means that the floor levels will not be consistent in the street.	The requirement that the finished floor level of new buildings to match or mediate between the dwelling on either side will ensure that continuity of the street is maintained.	No modification

Summary of Submissions – Amendment 4 to Local Planning Policy No. 7.5.15 – Character Retention and Heritage Areas

Issue/Comment Summary	Administration Response	Proposed modification (Attachment 4)
<p>36. It should be left to the owners choice of architectural style within standard guidelines.</p>	<p>During the initial phase of consultation, the community identified the importance of maintaining the original character of the nominated streets. This sentiment has also been expressed during the formal consultation phase. The proposed Guidelines replace or augment already existing planning provisions that ensure new development that is visible from the street has a positive regard to the bulk and scale of existing character homes and the prevailing pattern of development. The provisions extend only to the matters that were identified to be valuable to the community through the initial community workshop. All development not visible from the street will not be subject to the Guideline provisions. The Guidelines provide an opportunity for a proposal to be assessed on a performance basis against local housing objectives that ensure the prevailing character is respected, even where 'deemed-to-comply' outcomes are not met.</p>	<p>Modification 2</p>

Summary of Submissions – Amendment 4 to Local Planning Policy No. 7.5.15 – Character Retention and Heritage Areas

THEME : CARPORT AND GARAGES		
Survey question - Do you support the proposed provisions relating to carports and garages?		
Support		18
Object		15
Unsure		2

Issue/Comment Summary	Administration Response	Proposed modification (Attachment 4)
37. Support – The carport and garage provision will ensure that the open streetscape can be maintained.	Noted	No modification
38. Object – Small blocks and large setbacks make it difficult to include parking at the rear of the property. Parking should be allowed at the front even with a ROW or side access, owners should have the choice.	Deemed to comply provisions for carparking structures at the rear of the dwelling where a ROW is available is already a requirement of the R-Codes and City's Built Form Policy. Should an alternative location be considered a preferred alternative, the proposal can be assessed on a performance basis against the local housing objectives.	No modification
39. Object – Owners should be able to have a carport design that compliments the house.	Carparking structures in the front setback area can significantly alters the appearance of a streetscape. Structures in the front setback area that are of a complementary scale, colour and materials to the subservient dwelling will help to maintain the character of the street.	No modification
40. Object – The lots sizes do not allow for this provision (C4.7) with the retention of the original house. 6m carports should be allowed for 2/3 car family.	The intention of provision C4.7 is to ensure that car parking structures located within front setback areas do not obscure or detract from the predominant character elements of the dwelling or the street. A proposed carport that is greater than one third of the frontage (or 5.5m), may be permitted on a performance based merit, where it can be demonstrated that structure will not unduly impact view lines of the dwelling or the presentation of the dwelling to the streetscape.	No modification
41. Object – Parking in the street is dangerous and not practical, the City should be encouraging parking within the lot not on the street.	Noted.	No modification
42. Retention of the original character is inconsistent with front or side garage as there is simply not the space to practically build a carport at the front and comply with your guidelines unless you demolish the original house as not all houses have a ROW.	Retention of original character dwellings is an option that is encouraged and should be considered in the context of any new development. Carparking structures may be permitted on a performance based merit, where it can be demonstrated that structure can meet the objectives of the Guidelines and other development requirements beyond the scope of this policy.	No modification
43. The removal of the Queensland box trees and replacement with a more suitable species and undergrounding power will allow more space in the streetscape for parking.	The removal of street trees and underground power is a matter beyond the scope of this Amendment.	No modification

Summary of Submissions – Amendment 4 to Local Planning Policy No. 7.5.15 – Character Retention and Heritage Areas

GENERAL COMMENTS		
Survey question - Do you have any further comments?		
Issue/Comment Summary	Administration Response	Proposed modification (Attachment 4)
44. Support – If residents are supportive it's a great start to retaining character and other streets should be considered.	Noted.	No modification
45. Support – This should apply to more areas within Mt Hawthorn, not just the designated streets.	Noted. Policy No. 7.5.15 – Character Retention Areas sets out a community led process that provides opportunity for owners within all areas to nominate their streets to be considered for character retention. At this time, nominations have been received from the subject streets. The City's Administration undertook consultation with a broader area of Mt Hawthorn, however due to lack of community 'buy-in' at that time it was decided to proceed with character retention in the nominated areas in the current amendment.	No modification
46. Object – I do not support such a ridiculous scheme, it cannot be isolated to individual streets, it is not legal and should be voted on by the entire Vincent area and apply to all streets or none.	As above.	No modification
47. Object in part – This small portion of Buxton Street should not be include in the guidelines as there is already significant development that has altered the character of the area.	The portion of Buxton Street included in the Guidelines does represent a street in transition, with the recent development having moved away from the bulk, scale and form of the original character houses. On further review, it is considered that the City's Built Form Policy is adequate to address any proposals for development in this area.	Modification 1
48. Object – Why are only a small number of streets included.	As above.	
49. Object in part – Modern dwelling and extensions should be allowed. More focus should be on maintaining privacy and preventing overshadowing.	New dwellings can be more contemporary in nature, giving due consideration to traditional building forms and materials. Any proposed development will be required to comply with relevant overshadowing and visual privacy requirements of the R-Codes and the City's Planning Policy No. 7.1.1 - Built Form.	No modification
50. Object – Owners should have the choice to build in their preferred style and not be dictated to by restrictive guidelines.	In recognising the community sentiment and the intent to retain the original character of the area, the draft Guidelines provide a flexible approach to character retention, which do not restrict the ability to demolish an original dwelling. The Guidelines allow for redevelop in line with modern standards, while being respectful and complimentary to the prevailing character of the street. All development not visible from the street will not be subject to the Guideline provisions.	Modification 2

Summary of Submissions – Amendment 4 to Local Planning Policy No. 7.5.15 – Character Retention and Heritage Areas

51. It's unclear what percentage of actual residents in the street requested the inclusion of these streets.	The following support was received from landowners in the initial nomination: The Boulevard – 51% Kalgoorlie Street – 47% Matlock Street – 54% Buxton Street – 50%	No modification
--	---	-----------------

ADMINISTRATION MODIFICATIONS

The following modifications are proposed by Administration to add further clarity to the Guidelines.

Clause	Issue/Comment Summary	Proposed modification (Attachment 4)
52. Development objectives	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Reference to California Bungalows should be removed as there are different styles of architecture within the Inter-War period of architecture. The objectives should reinforce that the guidelines are focussed on development when viewed from the street. Further clarification that contemporary development may be included at the rear of an original dwelling should be included in the Development Objectives. 	Modification 4
53. Clause 6 - Street Walls and Fences	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Clause C6.1 should also apply to any fence within the front setback area, which may also include the side boundary fence. Further clarification is required that 'predominant style' refers to the original street fences not new fence styles. There is no guidance within the Policy that includes suitable materials for fences that are visible from the street. The inclusion of materials that reflect the predominant fences will provide greater clarity and seek cohesive design outcomes. 	Modification 8
54. Clause 7 – General Building design (prevailing character)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> The Guidelines fail to state that the prevailing character of the street is that of the original dwellings. It is unclear that 'existing dwellings' refers to the original character dwellings and not new dwellings. 	Modification 9
55. Clause 7.5 – General Building design (roof pitch)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Stating roof pitch to be between 30 – 40 could be challenged as it is noted that some Interwar period dwellings do have a lower roof pitch. This would be better expressed by referencing the existing dwellings roof pitch. The Guidelines fail to address roof pitch for carparking structures. The Guidelines do not clearly state that they apply to roof structures that are visible from the street. 	Modification 10
56. Clause 4 – Setbacks of Garages and Carports	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Clause C4.5 would be better expressed as must respect the existing dwellings predominant colour, scale and materials as direct matching may limit a considered design response. Reference to garages in the front setback area in C4.7 should be removed as garages are not permitted in the front setback area. 	Modification 6

Summary of Submissions – Amendment 4 to Local Planning Policy No. 7.5.15 – Character Retention and Heritage Areas

57. Clause 3 – Building heights	The inclusion of 'concealed roof height' conflicts with clause C7.5 which requires new development to have a roof pitch consistent with the prevailing character dwellings.	Modification 7
58. Landscaping	The quality of the area is strengthened by the landscaping. The inclusion of objectives pertaining to landscaping would provide guidance to the owners in the area.	Modification 11
59. General terminology	Where the term complement is used throughout the Guidelines it is recommended that the term respect is also used. To complement the existing dwelling and to respect the existing dwelling will ultimately be assessed by an informed and professional opinion and both terms strengthens the development objectives of the character retention guidelines.	Modification 12

THEME : HERITAGE AREAS		
Survey question - Do you support investigation into heritage areas for your street?		
	Support	Object
The Boulevarde – (Scarborough Beach Rd – Anzac Rd)	5	6
Kalgoorlie Street – (Ashby Street and Anzac Rd)	0	8
Buxton Street – (Anzac Rd - Britannia Rd)	0	1
Matlock Street – (Anzac Rd and Britannia Rd)	1	1
Outside the Guideline Area	11	2
TOTAL	19	18