

## 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.

Comments Received in Objection:	Administration's Comment:
<p><u>Open Space</u></p> <p>The lack of open space reduces the ability for future landscaping and planting.</p>	<p>The development proposes 57 percent open space which would exceed the minimum of 45 percent under the deemed-to-comply standards of the R Codes. This means that discretion is not being sought for this planning element.</p> <p>Deep soil and planting areas are provided within these open space areas that would enable future landscaping and planting opportunities, including five additional trees to the northern lot boundary, a tree within the front setback area and bamboo planting to the southern lot boundary.</p>
<p><u>Lot Boundary Setbacks</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The building bulk of the development encroaches onto other properties.</li> <li>• The two-storey box design is significantly imposing to single story homes adjacent.</li> <li>• The reduced setbacks result in loss of sunlight to adjoining properties as well as reduced ventilation.</li> <li>• The reduced setbacks affect the outlook from the neighbouring backyards and windows.</li> <li>• Boundary wall heights will provide building bulk impacts to adjoining properties and reduce sunlight.</li> <li>• The reduced setbacks will set a negative precedence for future developments in the area.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The scale, height and form of the proposed development is consistent with that of a R30 coded site that has a two-storey height standard under the Built Form Policy and which applies to the subject site and surrounding properties.</li> <li>• The proposed addition has been designed to incorporate contrasting colours and materials, and articulation provided through varying wall setbacks and openings to assist in reducing building bulk as it presents to adjoining properties and the street.</li> <li>• The ground floor wall of the southern elevation includes a family room wall and alfresco that is setback 1.4 metres in lieu of the 1.5 metre deemed-to-comply standard. This portion of wall would meet the deemed-to-comply building height and overshadowing, with its shadow cast entirely within the shadow that results from an existing 2.3 metre high wall on the boundary of the adjoining property. The majority of this portion of wall would also be obscured by the existing 2.3 metre high boundary wall on the adjoining property.</li> <li>• The ground floor wall that does not meet the deemed-to-comply standard incorporates varying colours and materials, and articulation through varying wall setbacks and openings to assist in reducing building bulk.</li> <li>• The proposed boundary wall to the southern lot boundary satisfies the deemed-to-comply standards.</li> <li>• Future development proposals are required to be assessed on their own merits against the applicable planning framework through the development application process.</li> </ul>

**Summary of Submissions:**

Comments Received in Objection:	Administration's Comment:
<p><u>Noise &amp; Odour</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerns relating to increased noise due to AC locations which is adjacent to bedrooms and alfresco areas.</li>   <li>• Concerns relating to range hood emissions to adjoining properties.</li>   <li>• Location of alfresco in close proximity to adjoining properties will impact noise and amenity of adjacent areas.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The location of any future air conditioning units has not been provided by the applicant. The location of any future air conditioning units would be required to comply with the standards of the City's Built Form Policy for air conditioning fixtures for single houses to be placed at the rear of the ground floor below the existing fence line.</li>   <li>• Odour can only be assessed by the City's Environmental Health Officers in consideration of a nuisance when the development has been constructed and should odour become an issue. Administration has no reason to believe that the proposed addition to a single house would result in an amenity impact by odour emission.</li>   <li>• All properties are required to maintain ongoing compliance with the <i>Environmental Protection (Noise) Regulations 1997</i> which includes the location and noise associated with air conditioning units and outdoor living areas.</li> </ul>
<p><u>Landscaping</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is insufficient landscaping provided and minimal trees.</li>   <li>• Landscaping is under the 30% canopy cover requirement.</li>   <li>• Location of additions will damage adjoining properties existing trees and gardens that have existed for a long time.</li>   <li>• The landscaping provided does not provide a sense of open space between dwellings.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Six (6) trees are proposed to the northern lot boundary and the street setback area. Bamboo planting along the southern lot boundary would be provided in addition to existing smaller plantings. This landscaping would make an effective contribution to the landscaping outcome and canopy coverage on site.</li>   <li>• 15.6 percent of the subject site as canopy coverage at maturity, noting that the City's Built Form Policy deemed-to-comply standard of 30 percent has not been approved by the Western Australian Planning Commission and are given regard only.</li>   <li>• All works are contained wholly within the lot boundaries to ensure there is no impact on adjoining properties.</li>   <li>• The landscaping outcome together with 57 percent open space which would exceed the minimum of 45 percent under the deemed-to-comply standards of the R Codes would ensure a sense of space between dwellings. The additional tree planting and canopy cover is appropriate and would be commensurate with the nature of the proposal which is an addition to an existing single house. This would provide for tree planting opportunities around the existing dwelling.</li> </ul>

## Summary of Submissions:

Comments Received in Objection:	Administration's Comment:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Erosion issues, lack of mature landscapes and grassed areas leads to increased pollution and sedimentation in rivers and streams. Erosion also destroys fertile land and leads to more flooding. Landscaping, especially grass and shrubs, hold the soil together with their roots.</li> <li>Mature trees and landscaping assist in air purification which will be affected.</li> <li>Without mature coverage of 30 percent, the natural cooling properties and shade opportunities in the summer are eliminated and discourages natural wildlife and ecosystems.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The development proposes to maintain the existing grassed areas in the front setback area and is proposing deep soil throughout the site in excess of the requirements of the Built Form Policy which would be landscaped. The subject site is within an urban location and is not in proximity to rivers and streams.</li> <li>Landscaping and mature trees assist in improving air quality. The subject site does not include any large mature trees that are being removed. The proposal includes the provision of six trees on-site.</li> <li>The proposed landscaping would provide 15.6 percent canopy coverage, in addition to other soft landscaping on-site. The landscaping would contribute to the creation of microclimates which would support the reduction in the urban heat island effect and provide habitat for wildlife.</li> </ul>
<p><u>Visual Privacy</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The development encroaches on the neighbouring properties privacy.</li> <li>Overlooking proposed from upper floor windows to adjoining properties rear yards. Request these windows are frosted.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The development proposes setbacks for major openings on the upper floor which meet the deemed-to-comply standards of the R Codes. This means that they are not subject to Council's discretion and are not required to be treated/obscured.</li> <li>The applicant has proposed five 'Magnolia Little Gem' trees on the northern side boundary which would assist in providing visual screening to the north facing upper floor major openings. The 'Magnolia Little Gem' is a commonly used tree species to provide visual screening due to its dense foliage and fast growing nature.</li> </ul>
<p><u>Overshadowing</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerns relating to overshadowing from boundary walls and reduced setbacks.</li> <li>Shadowing to the southern property will significant impact natural northern light in winter months.</li> <li>Concerns relating to lawn and plant growth due to vast shadowing proposed.</li> <li>Shadowing to adjoining properties will increase damp and moss/mould build-up.</li> <li>Concerns relating to solar power generation due to shadowing. Results in ongoing power loss and financial burden.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The overshadowing of the southern adjoining property that would result from the proposed development would satisfy the deemed-to-comply standards of the R Codes and is not subject to discretion.</li> <li>The shadow cast from the ground floor family room wall that is setback 1.4 metres in lieu of the deemed-to-comply 1.5 metres would fall entirely within the shadow already cast by the existing 2.3 metre high wall on the northern boundary of the adjoining property.</li> <li>The overshadowing assessment reflects a 'worst case scenario' at winter solstice (midday 21 June). Adjoining properties would retain access to direct sunlight for portions of the day.</li> <li>No solar panels are present on the properties to the south of the subject site and shadow would be cast to its southern aspect and would not impact on any future ability to install solar panels to take advantage of the northern aspect.</li> </ul>

## Summary of Submissions:

Comments Received in Objection:	Administration's Comment:
<p><u>Design</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The shipping box design and black colour of the development is inconsistent with the character of the street and surrounding area and will significantly impact the street and adjoining properties.</li> <li>The box design of the additions is not appealing to look at.</li> <li>The style is taking away from the federation style of Mt Hawthorn.</li> <li>Design of the development provides an adverse precedence to the area and encourages "concrete jungle".</li> <li>The black colour of the development will loom over adjoining properties.</li> <li>Decreases street aesthetic and value of properties.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The design of the proposed development is supported by the City's Design Review Panel (DRP) Chairperson. The DRP Chairperson noted that the development provides high quality materials with a sense of depth and texture to them.</li> <li>The DRP Chairperson also noted that a contemporary rear addition to a character house is a commonly recognised approach, visually representing the time periods in which both elements were constructed rather than trying to replicate the style of the character house.</li> <li>The upper level massing of the proposed development is located at the rear of the site reducing the visual impact on the streetscape.</li> <li>The development mitigates the impact of building bulk from adjoining properties through the variation of colours and materials. The DRP Chairperson noted that the 'Monument' cladding provides contrast to the design which is supported from an architectural perspective.</li> <li>Property values are not a relevant consideration under the planning framework.</li> </ul>
<p><u>Environmentally Sustainable Design</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The black colour of the additions are not environmentally sustainable and would require more cooling.</li> <li>Concerns regarding radiation of heat due to colour and scale of the additions.</li> <li>Concerns relating to radiation of heat and reflection due to mass of structure in summer months.</li> <li>The black box will provide more urban heat than any other design.</li> <li>The development will have a negative thermal performance.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The upper floor would be framed construction with reduced thermal mass, which would limit the potential to radiate heat to adjoining properties.</li> <li>The roof sheeting proposed is 'Shale Grey' in colour which has a solar absorption rating consistent with the standards of the City's Built Form Policy.</li> <li>The proposed development incorporates a mix of colours and materials including face brickwork, painted render and wood finish cladding. The extent of use of the 'Monument' colour is acceptable in considering the sustainability of the proposed addition in its entirety, noting that the Built Form Policy in itself does not prohibit the use of this colour for wall cladding. The DRP Chairperson also commented that a lighter colour cladding would have the potential to create more glare to adjoining property owners than the 'Monument' colour proposed.</li> </ul>
<p><u>Dividing Fence</u></p> <p>Concerns regarding the removal of dividing fences and financial implications of this for neighbouring properties.</p>	<p>Dividing fences are a civil matter to be resolved between the affected parties and governed by the <i>Dividing Fences Act 1961</i>. Dividing fences are not dealt with under the planning framework and no modifications to dividing fences are being considered as part of this application.</p>

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