

5.6 NO. 33A (LOT: 2; STR: 70869) REDFERN STREET, NORTH PERTH – PROPOSED DWELLING (GROUPED) This item has been WITHDRAWN at the applicant's request

TRIM Ref:	D18/53456
Author:	Clair Morrison, Urban Planner
Authoriser:	Cathrine Temple, A/Manager Approval Services
Ward:	North
Precinct:	8 – North Perth
Attachments:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Attachment 1 - Location and Consultation Plans 2. Attachment 2 - Development Plans 3. Attachment 3 - Applicant's Justification 4. Attachment 4 - Summary of Submissions and Applicant's Response 5. Attachment 5 - Summary of Submissions and Administration's Response

RECOMMENDATION:

That Council in accordance with the provisions of the City of Vincent Local Planning Scheme No. 2 and the Metropolitan Region Scheme, REFUSES the application for the Dwelling (Grouped) at No. 33a (Lot: 2; STR: 70869) Redfern Street, North Perth, in accordance with the plans provided in Attachment 2, for the following reasons:

1. The proposed street setback to Macri Lane does not meet the Design Principles P2.1 and P2.1 of Clause 5.1.2 of State Planning Policy No. 3.1 Residential Design Codes and the Local Housing Objectives of Clause 5.2 of Local Planning Policy No. 7.1.1 – Built Form as the street setback does not provide adequate open space for the dwelling to accommodate landscaping and the building mass and form does not minimise the proportion of the façade at ground level taken up by vehicle entries and parking, does not positively contribute to the development context of Macri Lane and does not incorporate design features to reduce the building bulk and scale onto Macri Lane;
2. The proposed lot boundary setbacks to No. 33 Redfern Street and No. 35 Redfern Street do not meet the Design Principles P3.1 of Clause 5.1.3 of State Planning Policy No. 3.1 Residential Design Codes as the impacts of building bulk on the western adjoining property and the overlooking and loss of privacy on the northern adjoining property resulting from the proposed setback will adversely impact on the amenity of the adjoining properties;
3. The proposed garage does not meet the Design Principles P1 of Clause 5.2.1 and P2 of Clause 5.2.2 of State Planning Policy No. 3.1 Residential Design Codes and the Local Housing Objectives of Clause 5.7 of Local Planning Policy No. 7.1.1 – Built Form, as it will detract from the streetscape and appearance of the dwelling given it is forward of the dwelling and occupies a greater proportion of the development frontage as viewed from Macri Lane;
4. The proposed open space does not meet the Design Principles P4 of Clause 5.1.4 of State Planning Policy No. 3.1 Residential Design Codes, as it does not reflect the existing streetscape character, does not reduce building bulk on the site and does not provide an attractive setting for buildings, landscape, vegetation or the streetscape;
5. The dimensions of the proposed outdoor living areas do not provide sufficient spaces for the areas to be used for active and passive use in conjunction with the dwelling; and
6. Having due consideration of subclauses 67(m) and (n) of Schedule 2 of the *Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015*, the development is not considered compatible with its setting due to the likely effect of building bulk, scale and appearance of the development on the character of the locality.