

Character Area Guidelines: Summary of Submissions

The tables below summarise the comments received during the advertising period for the character area guidelines, together with Administration’s response to each comment.

Orange Avenue and Hope Street Character Area Guidelines

Submitter Number	Comments Received	Administration Comment
1	The proposed guidelines will not enable the development of a new home and adversely affect the future enjoyment of my property.	<p>These guidelines have been designed in close collaboration with a working group made up of Orange Avenue and Hope Street residents and reflects the community’s vision for the precinct.</p> <p>The Residential Design Codes (and through it, this Character Area policy) provides for two separate pathways for development approval; deemed-to-comply and design principle.</p> <p>Should a development not meet the relevant deemed-to-comply criteria, a route to development approval can still occur via a performance assessment against the relevant design principles/local housing objectives.</p>
2	Orange Avenue and Hope Street is a unique historical area and it is important to celebrate this history. The guidelines provide a sensible and practical way to achieve this.	Support is noted.
3	We support the proposed guidelines	Support is noted.
4	I support the proposed guidelines	Support is noted.
5	I support the proposed guidelines. It is very important to preserve the character of this precinct and this submission will allow us to do this but still allow development that does not detract from this street character. I hope the City of Vincent will approve the submission to enable Orange Ave and Hope St to be recognised as a Character Area.	Support is noted.

Character Area Guidelines: Summary of Submissions

6	I would like to express my support for the Orange Avenue and Hope Street Character Guidelines. This is a unique area of Perth and its character deserves to be protected to retain its uniqueness and history. I appreciate the City of Vincent considering this.	Support is noted.
7	I support the proposed guidelines. I look forward to the character of the area being preserved.	Support is noted.
8	I support the proposed guidelines	Support is noted.
9	I'm writing as resident of Orange Avenue to express my support for the street character guidelines our little community has developed. I'd also like to congratulate the city for having the flexibility and foresight to have a process whereby a little community can establish guidelines like these. Guidelines that come from within the community and from my point of view are widely celebrated by the residents of these two streets.	Support is noted.
10	I support the proposed guidelines	Support is noted.
11	We support the proposed guidelines. Please consider amending figure 2 as so the new dwelling is in line with the existing dwellings. At the moment it's slightly forward of these which is contradictory to the provision.	Noted, figure 2 has been modified to bring the new dwelling in line with existing dwellings.
12	In principle, I support the document and it's objectives but don't necessarily agree with all of the details and wording of the document. I don't support the Chinese tallow trees as the best option for the verges and wonder if it's necessary or appropriate to put that into a character retention document (if anything, in my opinion the peppermint	Support is noted. Due to their prevalence in the proposed character area, Chinese Tallows have been included in the character statement. This statement will not preclude the City planting other tree species.

Character Area Guidelines: Summary of Submissions

	trees that are in the area are more in character with the history of the precinct)	
--	--	--

Character Area Guidelines: Summary of Submissions

Lacey Street Character Area Guidelines

No.	Comments Received	Administration Comment
1	<p>Lacey St does present a unique context which is well liked and appreciated by those that live and work in the street. It contains a good and sustainable mix of residential and commercial co-existing in a mutually inclusive environment. A key consideration is to ensure the street remains relevant and attractive for this cohabitation.</p> <p>In relation to the current Design Guidelines for Lacey St,</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Driveways are not infrequent, more than half the houses are serviced by driveways 2. The majority of properties are fenced 3. It is not only a lack of on site parking that results in a demand for street parking. This street also provides parking for some that work in the area and even those that work in the city. 4. Traffic in the street is 2 way but not at the same time. While sometimes inconvenient the single lane in 2 directions functions well with general courtesy and consideration. <p>With respect to future development</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. The scale of the building to the streetscape should be maintained b. Generally retain the front 2 rooms of a building in terms of street presentation c. Existing characteristics should be respected but not slavishly copied d. 2 stories permitted behind the front 2 rooms e. Upper storey rooflines can be visible from the street although in a recessive form. 	<p>Upper Floor Additions. The proposed guidelines required that second storey additions be located as so they are not visible from the 'public domain'. Following consultation, C3.1.1 is to be modified as such:</p> <p><i>"Above ground level extensions should be setback behind the apex of the roof, with complimentary roof forms and building massing"</i></p> <p>This new provision, along with the existing local housing objectives will aid in allowing for second storey additions that are respectful to the existing streetscape, whilst also ensuring that green space at the rear of properties is able to be maintained.</p> <p>The Built Form Policy currently restricts building height in this precinct to two storeys, however the new Medium Density Codes will see this height limit increased to four storeys. It is recommended that the following clause be added which seeks to maintain the existing height limit:</p> <p><i>"Development is not to exceed two storeys in height on lots identified as a contributory place"</i></p> <p>Given modification to height requires WAPC approval, the following note will be added:</p> <p><i>Note: Clause 1 Building Height represents a Council adopted policy position. However, this is subject to the Western Australian Planning Commission (WAPC) approval in accordance with Clause 3.2.3(b) of the R Codes. Unless the WAPC grants approval, the relevant deemed-to-comply provisions of the R Codes apply.</i></p>

Character Area Guidelines: Summary of Submissions

No.	Comments Received	Administration Comment
	<p>f. Carports to be permitted to the side behind the main building line with sympathetic or non-intrusive roofs</p> <p>With respect to the last comment, because the lots are small it is necessary to retain as much ground area as possible and not utilise valuable rear open space for car parking.</p> <p>This is important to maintain outdoor living areas for occupants and particularly families.</p> <p>If owners are to be constricted with development parameters on their property for the benefit of the general community, then the Council also must be prepared to assist with respect to</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. encouraging landscaping on street verges and not infilling concrete b. street trees and particularly with consideration of the scale and detritus of the London Plain Trees c. the process whereby rubbish is collected by several different trucks on different days. It is an anathema to maintain the scale and aesthetics of this street and then create a situation promoting the proliferation of heavy vehicles. d. Prioritising the street for underground power <p>Lacey Street does not have sufficient significance to be maintained as a Heritage precinct.</p> <p>However, it definitely warrants the designation and controls of a Character Area with deliberate consideration of the demolition provisions.</p>	<p>Should Lacey Street become a heritage area, the City will be able to modify height provisions without WAPC approval.</p> <p>Garage and Carports: The comment is noted, C3.1.4 of the draft guidelines required that garages and carports be located behind the existing building setback. This is to be modified as follows:</p> <p><i>“Garages and carports are to be located behind the predominant building line”</i></p> <p>An additional Local Housing Objective is to be added as follows:</p> <p><i>“the roof form of garages and carports are to be sympathetic to the roof form of the existing dwelling”</i></p> <p>Public Realm Improvements: These comments are noted, however this policy seeks to provide guidance on development within the private realm, not the public realm.</p> <p>The City’s Infrastructure and Environment directorate are currently investigating increased planting in the public realm. As part of this, the community will be consulted on species and locations.</p> <p>Heritage Classification: Character guidelines cannot enforce the protection of dwellings from demolition, only guide against. Nor can a character policy enforce conservation principles. Administration will conduct a review of Lacey Street with a qualified heritage consultant to ascertain if it has the characteristics that would qualify for a heritage area designation. This review will occur after of the adoption of this policy.</p>

Character Area Guidelines: Summary of Submissions

No.	Comments Received	Administration Comment
		<p>Clause 1 Demolition will remain; however, the following note will be included:</p> <p><i>“Schedule 2, Part 7, Clause 61(1)(e) in the Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015 does not require a development application for the demolition of a single house or grouped dwelling where the structure is not affected by heritage legislation. Clause 1 has been included as to encourage the retention of the character homes on Lacey Street”</i></p> <p>In addition, the deemed to comply criteria for Clause 2 Conservation and Clause 7 Materials and Colours will become local housing objectives.</p> <p>Should Lacey Street become a Heritage Area, clauses 1, 2 and 7 will be modified to reflect this.</p>
2	<p>I would like to confirm that I support the proposed Character Area Guidelines proposed for Lacey St with the following qualifications:</p> <p>1. That second story additions be permitted subject to a requirement that they be behind the ridge line of the existing property and that the parts visible to the street be recessive and sympathetic to the character of the original building. The requisite setbacks should be retained so as not to create a ‘wall’ of properties that that would create a visual enclosure and that might impose on the Lacey Street streetscape and on the Pier and Stirling Street properties.</p> <p>2. That consideration be given to the residence on the corner of Lacey and Brisbane Streets and the Liberal Catholic Church on the corner of Lacey and Brewer Streets being</p>	<p>Support for the guidelines is noted.</p> <p>Scale and Presentation to the Street: As per the comment above, C3.1.1 is to be included as follows</p> <p><i>“Above ground level extensions to contributory places should be setback behind the apex of the roof of the retained dwelling, with complimentary roof forms and building massing”</i></p> <p>The existing Design Guidelines for Lacey Street included 33 Brisbane Street and 72 Brewer Street as ‘gateway properties’ as they reflected a building design which is differs from the prevalent federation cottage style of architecture. These guidelines to treat these properties as ‘non-contributory’ places.</p>

Character Area Guidelines: Summary of Submissions

No.	Comments Received	Administration Comment
	<p>deemed to be contributory places, these properties framing the area in a manner that is not inconsistent with its character.</p> <p>I support the City of Vincent taking steps towards obtaining heritage protection <i>of the street</i> on the basis providing that the dwellings themselves are <u>not</u> Heritage listed but rather Lacey Street itself holding the heritage significance so that for example, the façade and fundamental characteristics of the dwellings on Lacey Street be preserved.</p> <p>I support the street verges to be restored and for additional tree planting to be provided and further support that the <i>existing</i> plane trees being noted as part of the street heritage significance. I do not necessarily support further planting of the <i>plane trees</i> species unless the council undertook regular street sweeping and cleaning of the verges which is undertaken on other streets (more trafficked) in this area.</p>	<p>The future heritage assessment of Lacey Street will include these properties and may see this classification change.</p> <p>Public Realm Improvements: These comments are noted, however this policy seeks to provide guidance on development within the private realm, not the public realm.</p> <p>The City’s Infrastructure and Environment directorate are currently investigating increased planting in the public realm. As part of this, the community will be consulted on species and locations.</p>
3	<p>We support the proposed Character Area Guidelines proposed for Lacey St with the following qualifications:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. That second story additions be permitted subject to a requirement that they be behind the ridge line of the existing property and that the parts visible to the street be recessive and sympathetic to the character of the original building. The requisite set backs should be retained so as not to create a ‘wall’ of properties that that would create a visual enclosure and that might impose on the Lacey Street streetscape and on the Pier and Stirling Street properties. 2. That consideration be given to the residence on the corner of Lacey and Brisbane Streets and the Liberal Catholic 	<p>Scale and Presentation to the Street: As per the comment above, C3.1.1 is to be included as follows:</p> <p><i>“Above ground level extensions to contributory places should be setback behind the apex of the roof of the retained dwelling, with complimentary roof forms and building massing”</i></p> <p>New Contributory Places The existing Design Guidelines for Lacey Street included 33 Brisbane Street and 72 Brewer Street as ‘gateway properties’ as they reflected a building design which is differs from the prevalent federation cottage style of architecture. These guidelines seek to treat these properties in a similar manner and classify them as ‘non-contributory’ places.</p>

Character Area Guidelines: Summary of Submissions

No.	Comments Received	Administration Comment
	<p>Church on the corner of Lacey and Brewer Streets being deemed to be contributory places, these properties framing the area in a manner that is not inconsistent with its character.</p> <p>We also request that the City of Vincent take steps towards obtaining heritage protection of the street.</p> <p>Finally, we support other requests made at a recent street consultation for street verges to be restored and for additional tree planting. We also believe that the existing plane trees are worthy of registration as significant trees, being part of the heritage street scape.</p>	<p>The future heritage assessment of Lacey Street will include these properties and may see this classification change.</p> <p>Public Realm Improvements: These comments are noted, however this policy seeks to provide guidance on development within the private realm, not the public realm.</p> <p>The City’s Infrastructure and Environment directorate are currently investigating increased planting in the public realm. As part of this, the community will be consulted on species and locations</p>
	<p>In viewing the draft guidelines I was concerned at the graphic and notation which stated that second floor additions should be “not visible from the public realm”. If that were the case then both properties at 11 and 26 might fall foul of this design intent.</p> <p>As you can see from the graphic below, in order to achieve a second storey addition not visible from the public realm necessitates a reduction in the backroad space of the cottages, and the construction of additional floor space and foundations to accommodate such a dramatically set-back extension.</p> <p>We had hoped, in the future, to build a moderate second floor addition nestled on top of the back half of our existing floor plan, preserving our precious backyard and established trees and leafy shady outdoor space.</p>	<p>Scale and Presentation to the Street: As noted above, the provision related to second storey additions to contributory places has now been modified. It will read as such:</p> <p><i>“Above ground level extensions to contributory places should be setback behind the apex of the roof of the retained dwelling, with complimentary roof forms and building massing”</i></p> <p>This new provision, along with the existing local housing objectives will aid in allowing for second storey additions which are respectful to the existing streetscape, whilst also ensuring that green space at the rear of properties is able to be maintained.</p> <p>Should a development not meet the deemed-to-comply criteria, then the applicant can undertake a performance assessment against the relevant design principles/local housing objectives.</p>

Character Area Guidelines: Summary of Submissions

No.	Comments Received	Administration Comment
	<p>By requiring extensions to be not at all visible from the street, this will encourage landowners to reduce the size of their green space - which is not a desirable outcome for the City in my view.</p> <p>I am seeking Council's assurance that in the future, the owners of Lacey street will be allowed to build additions to their properties in a way that is sympathetic to the precinct and makes important improvements to the liveability of the properties without having to ensure that the extensions are entirely hidden from street view.</p> <p>Some leeway for commonsense and architectural merit should be afforded to owners - who love their character properties but might want to upgrade their homes as finances allow.</p> <p>Can you please ask that the City's Administration consider what level of flexibility could be applied for design excellence to ensure that these treasured homes can be modernised and extended sympathetically in the years ahead?</p> <p>Do the draft guidelines currently afford some discretion to achieve design excellence, or will they restrict future developments to being invisible from the street, and therefore eradicating our precious already rather small back yards?</p> <p>On another note, though the property is on Brisbane Street, the original neighbourhood Grocer at 26 Brisbane Street provides the visual termination of the Lacey Street Heritage</p>	<p>New Contributory Places</p> <p>The places listed as contributory places in these guidelines were carried over from the existing Design Guidelines for Lacey Street. The property at 26 Brisbane Street was not included in the existing guidelines. These guidelines do not seek to increase the size of the character area beyond what is existing. The future heritage review of Lacey Street may see this property included in the heritage area.</p>