

5.1 NO. 80 (LOT: 102; D/P: 413590) AUCKLAND STREET, NORTH PERTH - PROPOSED SINGLE HOUSE

Ward: North

- Attachments:**
1. Consultation and Location Map
 2. Development Plans
 3. Auckland Street Render and Perspective
 4. Summary of Submission - Administration Response
 5. Summary of Submission - Applicant Response
 6. Design Review Panel Comments - Applicant Response
 7. Original Development Plans
 8. Determination Advice Notes

RECOMMENDATION:

That Council, in accordance with the provisions of the City of Vincent Local Planning Scheme No. 2 and the Metropolitan Region Scheme, APPROVES the application for a Single House at No. 80 (Lot: 102; D/P: 413590) Auckland Street, North Perth in accordance with the plans shown in Attachment 2, subject to the following conditions, with the associated determination advice notes in Attachment 8:

1. Development Plans

This approval is for Single House as shown on the approved plans dated 2 June 2023. No other development forms part of this approval;

2. External Fixtures

All external fixtures, such as television antennas (of a non-standard type), radio and other antennae, satellite dishes, solar panels, external hot water heaters, air conditioners, and the like, shall not be visible from the street(s), are designed integrally with the building, and be located so as not to be visually obtrusive, to the satisfaction of the City;

3. Colour and Materials

Prior to the lodgement of a building permit, a schedule detailing the colour and texture of the building materials, demonstrating that the proposed development complements the surrounding area, shall be submitted to and approved by the City. The development must be finished, and thereafter maintained, in accordance with the schedule approved by the City, prior to occupation or use of the development;

4. Visual Privacy

Prior to occupancy or use of the development, all privacy screening shown on the approved plans shall be installed and shall be visually impermeable and is to comply in all respects with the requirements of Clause 5.4.1 (Visual Privacy) of the Residential Design Codes Volume 1 deemed-to-comply provisions, to the satisfaction of the City;

5. Boundary Walls

The surface finish of boundary walls facing an adjoining property shall be of a good and clean condition, prior to the practical completion of the development, and thereafter maintained, to the satisfaction of the City. The finish of boundary walls is to be fully rendered or face brick, or material as otherwise approved, to the satisfaction of the City;

6. Street Walls and Fences

The gate and/or fencing infill panels above the approved solid portions of wall shall be visually permeable in accordance with the Residential Design Codes, to the satisfaction of the City;

7. Stormwater

Stormwater from all roofed and paved areas shall be collected and contained on site. Stormwater must not affect or be allowed to flow onto or into any other property or road reserve;

8. Landscaping

8.1 An updated detailed landscape and reticulation plan for the development site and adjoining road verge, to the satisfaction of the City, shall be lodged with and approved by the City prior to lodgement of a Building Permit. The plan shall be drawn to a scale of 1:100 and show the following:

- The location and type of existing and proposed trees and plants;
- Spacing between and pot size of proposed trees and plantings;
- Low maintenance groundcover and shrubs, such as native *hibberta scandens* (Snake Vine) or *grevillea obtusifolia* (Gin Gin Gem);
- Areas to be irrigated or reticulated;
- The provision of a minimum 15 percent deep soil and planting areas, as defined by the City's Policy No. 7.1.1 – Built Form; and
- The provision of trees to maximise canopy coverage within deep soil and planting areas and within the front setback area. The tree species are to be in accordance with the City's recommended tree species list;

8.2 All works shown in the plans as identified in Condition 8.1 above shall be undertaken in accordance with the approved plans to the City's satisfaction, prior to occupancy or use of the development and maintained thereafter to the satisfaction of the City at the expense of the owners/occupiers; and

9. Car Parking and Access

9.1 The layout and dimensions of all driveways and parking areas shall be in accordance with AS2890.1; and

9.2 All driveways, car parking and manoeuvring area(s) which form part of this approval shall be sealed, drained, paved and line marked in accordance with the approved plans prior to the first occupation of the development and maintained thereafter by the owner/occupier to the satisfaction of the City.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

The purpose of this report is to consider an application for development approval for a two storey single house at No. 80 Auckland Street, North Perth (the subject site).

The subject site, as well as the property to the north (No. 31 Gill Street), both coded R20 were created through subdivision of the parent lot in 2016. The eastern side of Auckland Street comprises of R20 coded lots with sufficient site area to enable two lot subdivisions, some of which have already been subdivided. As the eastern side of Auckland Street continues to be subdivided, the streetscape and street setback pattern would reflect smaller lot sizes.

The subject site is a 353 square metres in area, slopes down by 2.2 metres from its northern side boundary to its southern side boundary, and is an irregular shaped lot. It features a wider frontage compared to its depth and has an angled street boundary alignment to Auckland Street. The site is also affected by a 2.5 metre sewer easement along the full extent of its rear boundary. This limits approximately 27 percent of the site area that could be developed with buildings having consideration to the sewer easement and compliance with the 7.7 metre street setback deemed-to-comply standard.

The subject site being the result of the subdivision of a corner lot and with these abovementioned site characteristics means that it has unique circumstances that are not present with other lots capable of subdivision in the area.

The site characteristics have largely driven the design response of the proposed single house, and the planning elements where the design principle and local housing objective assessment is being sought by the applicant. The areas of discretion being sought under this assessment relate to reduced street setback and resultant building within this front setback area, as well as outdoor living area co-located in the front setback area and a portion of building wall setback to the northern boundary.

The street setbacks and siting of building height of the proposed development has been informed by development on adjoining properties and would provide for an appropriate transition between these properties. The proposed upper floor and garage are stepped back to moderate the impact of building bulk on the streetscape. Deep soil and planting areas are also located to the front setback area to further assist with softening the appearance of the development as viewed from the street, and the proposed development would not adversely impact the amenity of the surrounding properties.

The proposed development has been the subject of numerous iterations of revised plans over the course of its assessment. The modifications made has resulted in the proposed development being acceptable as considered against the planning framework, and is recommended for approval subject to conditions.

PROPOSAL:

The application proposes a two storey single house to a vacant lot at No. 80 Auckland Street, North Perth. The proposed development plans are included as **Attachment 2**.

BACKGROUND:

Landowner:	Number 80 Pty Ltd
Applicant:	Coastview Australia Pty Ltd
Client:	Number 80 Pty Ltd
Date of Application:	25 November 2022
Zoning:	MRS: Urban LPS2: Zone: Residential R Code: R20
Built Form Area:	Residential
Existing Land Use:	Vacant
Proposed Use Class:	Single House
Lot Area:	353m ²
Right of Way (ROW):	No
Heritage List:	No

Site Context and Zoning

The subject site is bound by Auckland Street to the west, a vacant site that is currently undergoing construction of a two-storey single house to the north, and single storey single houses to the east and south. Beyond Auckland Street to the west is the Gill Street Car Park which is a local reserve for public open space. A location plan is provided as **Attachment 1**.

The subject site and surrounding properties are zoned Residential R20 under the City's Local Planning Scheme No. 2 (LPS2) and are located within the Residential Built Form Area under the City's Policy No. 7.1.1 – Built Form (Built Form Policy), with a building height standard of two storeys.

Existing Streetscape

Auckland Street is characterised by a mixture of contemporary and Californian Bungalow housing styles that range between one and two storeys in height. Where provided, there are both examples of upper floors that are set back, as well projecting forward of the building alignment on the ground floor.

The streetscape features carports and garages with varying front setbacks at ground level, as well as uncovered car parking areas in the front setback area. Where front fencing is provided, they are generally low street walls or visually permeable fencing on top of street walls.

Front setback areas of homes are landscaped and Auckland Street is lined with established street trees. Gill Street Car Park located directly opposite the subject site features mature trees and plantings around its perimeter, with car parking located central to the site.

Lot Creation and Site Characteristics

The subject site was created through a subdivision approved by the Western Australian Planning Commission in 2016. The subdivision resulted in the creation of two lots, one being the subject site and the other being No. 31 Gill Street, which adjoins the property to the north. The primary street frontage of the subject site was formerly the secondary street frontage of the parent lot prior to subdivision occurring.

The subject site is currently vacant, with the previous house and associated structures on the parent lot having been demolished in 2018. The site slopes down by 2.2 metres from its northern to southern boundaries.

The subject site is irregularly shaped as a result of the angled alignment of Auckland Street and the dimensions of the lot. The subject site presents a 26.2 metre frontage to Auckland Street, with a northern side boundary depth of 18.3 metres and a southern side boundary depth of 10.0 metres. This means that the lot has a wider street frontage than it has lot depth.

Sewer Easement

The subject site is affected by a 2.5 metre wide sewer easement which runs along the full extent of the rear lot boundary. The sewer main is owned by the Water Corporation.

The Water Corporation confirmed that:

- There is a 0.15 metre diameter PVC sewer main running parallel along the inside of the rear boundary approximately 1 metre away and at a depth of approximately 1 metre;
- Encroachment into the easement is possible, so long as the building is no closer than 0.6 metres to the centreline of the sewer main; and
- There is a maintenance shaft located at the south-eastern corner of the subject site, which would require a setback of 1 metre from any building to the edge of the maintenance shaft.

Previous Development Approvals

Since the subject site was created following subdivision approval issued in 2016, the following development approvals have been granted for the site.

- A development approval issued in 2018 for a single storey single house.
- A development approval issued in 2020 for a two storey single house.
- An amendment to the 2020 development approval that was issued in 2021. This amended approval is valid until 10 July 2024 and was granted during the State of Emergency planning changes.

DETAILS:**Summary Assessment**

The table below summarises the planning assessment of the proposal against the provisions of the City of Vincent Local Planning Scheme No. 2 (LPS2), the City's Policy No. 7.1.1 – Built Form and State Planning Policy 7.3 - Residential Design Codes Volume 1 (R Codes). In each instance where the proposal requires the discretion of Council, the relevant planning element is discussed in the Detailed Assessment section following from this table.

Planning Element	Use Permissibility/ Deemed-to-Comply	Requires the Discretion of Council
Street Setback		✓
Front Fence	✓	
Building Setbacks/Boundary Wall		✓
Building Height/Storeys	✓	
Open Space	✓	
Outdoor Living Areas		✓
Landscaping (R Codes)		✓
Visual Privacy	✓	
Vehicle Parking & Access	✓	
Solar Access	✓	

Planning Element	Use Permissibility/ Deemed-to-Comply	Requires the Discretion of Council
Site Works/Retaining Walls	✓	
External Fixtures	✓	
Surveillance	✓	

Detailed Assessment

The R Codes and Built Form Policy have two pathways for assessing and determining a development application, being a deemed-to-comply pathway or a design principles and local housing objectives pathway.

The deemed-to-comply standards are one way of satisfactorily meeting the design principles or local housing objectives and are often quantitative measures.

Design principles and local housing objectives are qualitative measures which describe the outcome that is sought rather than the way that it can be achieved.

If a planning element of an application meets the applicable deemed-to-comply standard/(s) then it is satisfactory and not subject to Council’s discretion for the purposes of assessment against the Built Form Policy and R Codes.

If a planning element of an application does not meet the applicable deemed-to-comply standard/(s) then Council’s discretion is required to decide whether the element meets the applicable design principles and local housing objectives.

The planning elements of the application that do not meet the applicable deemed-to-comply standards and require the discretion of Council are as follows:

Street Setback	
Deemed-to-Comply Standard	Proposal
<p>Built Form Policy Volume 1 Clause 5.1 – Street Setback</p> <p>Primary Street Setback: 7.7 metres</p> <p>Porch Setback: 3.8 metres</p> <p>Walls on upper floors to be setback 2.0 metres behind the ground floor building line.</p> <p>Balconies to be setback 1.0 metre behind the ground floor building line.</p>	<p>Living and Dining Rooms Setback: 2.9 metres Alfresco Setback: 3.0 metres</p> <p>Porch Setback: 2.7 metres</p> <p>Upper Floor Sitting Room is setback 0.7 metres behind the ground floor building line.</p> <p>Balcony is setback 0.6 metres behind the ground floor building line.</p>
Lot Boundary Setbacks/Boundary Wall	
Deemed-to-Comply Standard	Proposal
<p>R Codes Volume 1 Clause 5.1.3 – Lot Boundary Setback</p> <p><u>Northern Lot Boundary Setback:</u> Ground Floor Bed/Study: 1.5 metres</p> <p><u>Northern Boundary Wall:</u> Boundary walls are not to be located within the front setback area (7.7 metres).</p>	<p><u>Northern Lot Boundary Setback:</u> Ground Floor Bed/Study: 1.2 metres</p> <p><u>Northern Boundary Wall:</u> Garage/Store boundary wall along northern lot boundary is located within the front setback area (5.6 metres).</p>

Outdoor Living Areas	
Deemed-to-Comply Standard	Proposal
R Codes Volume 1 Clause 5.3.1 – Outdoor Living Areas	
Outdoor living area to be provided behind the street setback area.	A portion of outdoor living area is located within the street setback area.
Landscaping	
Deemed-to-Comply Standard	Proposal
R Codes Volume 1 Clause 5.3.2 – Landscaping	
No more than 50% of street setback area to consist of impervious surfaces.	The street setback area consists of 81.1% as impervious surfaces.

The above elements of the proposal do not meet the specified deemed-to-comply standards and are discussed in the Comments section below.

CONSULTATION/ADVERTISING:

First Community Consultation Period

Community consultation was undertaken on the lodged development plans, as included in **Attachment 7**, in accordance with the *Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015* for a period of 14 days between 25 January 2023 and 8 February 2023. The method of consultation included a notice on the City's website and seven letters being sent to the adjoining and adjacent landowners and occupiers, as shown in **Attachment 1** and in accordance with the City's Community and Stakeholder Engagement Policy.

Nine submissions were received at the conclusion of the advertising period, all of which were objecting of the proposal.

Concerns raised in the submissions are summarised as follows:

- Inconsistent with predominantly single storey dwellings in the surrounding area.
- Upper floor building bulk to the street and to the east.
- Inadequate landscaping.
- Streetscape presentation is inconsistent with character of the area.
- Visual privacy concerns.

Following the community consultation period, amended plans dated 29 March 2023 and additional information was submitted by the applicant, and then again on 24 April 2023.

A summary of the key changes made as part of these amended plans is as follows:

- Increased street setback to the dwelling on the ground floor. porch and garage.
- Increased garage, and upper floor dwelling and balcony setback to the ground floor building line.
- Reduced northern boundary wall length.
- Reduced ground floor wall to the northern side boundary.
- The eastern façade was modified to increase articulation, introducing the stepping forward of the upper floor Bed 4 and WC of the dwelling.
- Reduced street fence pier width.
- Provision of a landscaping plan and subsequent modifications to provide additional detail.
- Increased minimum dimension of Bed 4.
- Decreased upper floor bathroom area.

Second Community Consultation Period

The amended plans dated 24 April 2023 were readvertised. The second community consultation was for a period of seven days between 3 May 2023 and 10 May 2023 in accordance with the City’s Community and Stakeholder Engagement Policy.

Five submissions of objection were received for the revised proposal. The submissions largely reiterated concerns that were raised during the first round of community consultation. New concerns from the second round of community consultation are summarised as follows:

- Safety concerns with future occupants misusing the pool.
- Building height.
- Setbacks to the southern side boundary.
- Setback of the garage to the ground floor building alignment.
- Outdoor living area size and location.
- Insufficient landscaping outcome.
- Extent of community consultation.

A summary of submissions received across the two community consultation periods along with Administration’s responses to each comment is provided in **Attachment 4**. The applicant’s response to the submissions received are provided as **Attachment 5**.

Amended plans have subsequently been submitted. A copy of the final set of development plans to be considered by Council is included within **Attachment 2**. In accordance with the City’s Community and Stakeholder Engagement Policy, the plans were not readvertised due to the amendments presenting no new departures to the deemed-to-comply standards. Previous submitters have been notified.

Design Review Panel (DRP):

Referred to DRP: Yes

The proposal was referred on three occasions to the City’s DRP Chairperson for comment as considered against the 10 principles of good design. The DRP Chairperson’s summarised comments, the applicant’s responses to these and subsequent amendments made to the plans are included in **Attachment 6**.

The Table below provides a summary of the application’s design review progress.

Design Review Progress			
	<i>Supported</i>		
	<i>Pending further attention</i>		
	<i>Not supported</i>		
	<i>No comment provided / Insufficient information</i>		
	<i>DRP Chairperson</i>		
	<i>Referral 1 – Plans dated 25 November 2022</i>	<i>Referral 2 – Plans dated 29 March 2023</i>	<i>Referral 3 – Plans dated 24 April 2023</i>
Principle 1 – Context & Character			
Principle 2 – Landscape Quality			
Principle 3 – Built Form and Scale			
Principle 4 – Functionality & Built Quality			
Principle 5 – Sustainability			
Principle 6 – Amenity			
Principle 7 – Legibility			
Principle 8 – Safety			
Principle 9 – Community			
Principle 10 – Aesthetics			

The table below provides a summary of the DRP Chairperson comments in respect to their last referral response based on amended plans dated 24 April 2023, along with Administration's response.

Principle 1 – Context & Character	
DRP Chairperson Comments	Administration Response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The front setback and positioning of the double garage in front of the main façade of the house is not reflective of the surrounding area. Further information is needed in relation to the surrounding context. Given the irregular shaped site, it is difficult to develop a character style of house. Most character house styles have a lot which is deeper than it is wide and provide a larger upper level setback. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The acceptability of the proposed street setback is detailed in the Comments section. The garage positioned 0.5 metres behind the dwelling alignment complies with the deemed-to-comply standard of the Built Form Policy. The character and context of the surrounding area is further considered in the Comments section. The site characteristics and constraints are acknowledged. The proposed dwelling has been designed to incorporate the stepping back of the upper floor, and the proposal has been considered against the standards of the Built Form Policy and the R Codes. This is further detailed in the Comments section.
Principle 2 – Landscape Quality	
DRP Chairperson Comments	Administration Response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Preference generally for a landscaping plan to be prepared by a landscape architect or professional to ensure a viable landscaping outcome is achieved. Details of plant spacings, pot/tree sizes, reticulation and species to be included in landscaping plan. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The City's Parks team has reviewed the landscaping plan and is generally supportive of the species selection. The Built Form Policy does not require a landscaping plan to be prepared by a landscape architect or equivalent, rather it sets out the landscaping outcome to be achieved. Landscaping is further detailed in the Comments section. Further specifications are to be provided in an updated landscaping plan, recommended as a condition of approval.
Principle 3 – Built Form and Scale	
DRP Chairperson Comments	Administration Response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Both the primary street and rear setback do not appear consistent with the surrounding context. The built form appears too large for a shallow and irregular shaped site. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed single house has been designed to respond to the primary street setbacks of the adjoining and adjacent developments. This is detailed in the Comments section. The proposed rear setbacks comply with the deemed-to-comply standards of the R Codes. The proposed development meets the deemed-to-comply standards for building height and open space (building footprint) of the R Codes and Built Form Policy. These controls inform the developable area of the site. Street setback also moderates the size of developments and this is considered further in the Comments section and in considering the site characteristics.
Principle 5 – Sustainability	
DRP Chairperson Comments	Administration Response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Environmentally sustainable design initiatives to be integrated. Living spaces and the main bedroom are orientated south or west, with minimal northern light access. Shading to western facing windows. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Environmentally sustainable design considerations and measures that have been incorporated are addressed in the Comments section.

Principle 6 – Amenity	
DRP Chairperson Comments	Administration Response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bedroom 4 should have a minimum 3 metre dimension. Bedroom 4 is reliant on high level window for amenity. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The R Codes and Built Form Policy does not include a deemed-to-comply standard for minimum bedroom dimension and does not restrict the provision of high level windows to bedrooms. Bedroom 4 minimum dimension increased to have a 2.95 metre minimum dimension and would be functional and capable of use. The high level window to Bedroom 4 is to the eastern wall and provides access to morning sun all year round and is operable to enable ventilation. It would not result in overlooking to the eastern adjoining property.
Principle 10 – Aesthetics	
DRP Chairperson Comments	Administration Response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The rear elevation is lacking diversity of textural materiality. Incorporating face brick at ground level better reflects traditional style housing. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The rear elevation has been treated with contrasting coloured render to the upper floor and moulding strips to differentiate between the ground and upper floors. This has been updated on amended plans to respond to the DRP Chair comment. The setback of the walls meet the R Codes deemed-to-comply standards. Amended plans have been submitted to incorporate face brick at the ground floor of the proposed development. This is shown in the streetscape perspective included as Attachment 3.

The applicant made further amendments to the development plans in response to the DRP comments. These were not referred back to the DRP Chairperson, as the changes made were to make improvements to and to further address the DRP Chairperson's previous comments.

LEGAL/POLICY:

- Planning and Development Act 2005;*
- Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015;*
- City of Vincent Local Planning Scheme No. 2;
- State Planning Policy 7.3 – Residential Design Codes;
- Community and Stakeholder Engagement Policy; and
- Policy No. 7.1.1 – Built Form Policy.

Planning and Development Act 2005

In accordance with Schedule 2, Clause 76(2) of the *Planning and Development (Local Planning Scheme) Regulations 2015*, and Part 14 of the *Planning and Development Act 2005*, the applicant would have the right to apply to the State Administrative Tribunal for a review of Council's determination.

Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015

In accordance with [Clause 67\(2\)](#) of the Deemed Provisions in the Planning Regulations and in determining a development application, Council is to have due regard to a range of matters to the extent that these are relevant to the development application.

Local Planning Scheme No. 2

The objectives of the Residential zone under LPS2 are a relevant consideration for the application. These objectives are:

- *To provide for a range of housing and a choice of residential densities to meet the needs of the community;*
- *To facilitate and encourage high quality design, built form and streetscapes throughout residential areas;*
- *To provide for a range of non-residential uses, which are compatible with and complementary to residential development;*
- *To promote and encourage design that incorporates sustainability principles, including but not limited to solar passive design, energy efficiency, water conservation, waste management and recycling;*
- *To enhance the amenity and character of the residential neighbourhood by encouraging the retention of existing housing stock and ensuring new development is compatible within these established areas;*
- *To manage residential development in a way that recognises the needs of innovative design and contemporary lifestyles; and*
- *To ensure the provision of a wide range of different types of residential accommodation, including affordable, social and special needs, to meet the diverse needs of the community.*

Delegation to Determine Applications:

This application is being referred to Council for determination in accordance with the City's Register of Delegations, Authorisations and Appointments. This is because the application received more than five objections during the community consultation period.

RISK MANAGEMENT IMPLICATIONS:

There are minimal risks to Council and the City's business function when Council exercises its discretionary power to determine a planning application.

STRATEGIC IMPLICATIONS:

This is in keeping with the City's Strategic Community Plan 2022-2032:

Innovative and Accountable

Our decision-making process is consistent and transparent, and decisions are aligned to our strategic direction.

SUSTAINABILITY IMPLICATIONS:

The City has assessed the application against the environmentally sustainable design provisions of the City's Policy No. 7.1.1 – Built Form. These provisions are informed by the key sustainability outcomes of the City's Sustainable Environment Strategy 2019-2024, which requires new developments to demonstrate best practice in respect to reductions in energy, water and waste and improving urban greening.

PUBLIC HEALTH IMPLICATIONS:

This is in keeping with the following priority health outcomes of the City's *Public Health Plan 2020-2025*:

FINANCIAL/BUDGET IMPLICATIONS:

There are no finance or budget implications from this report.

COMMENTS:

Summary Assessment

In assessing the application against the planning framework, it is recommended for approval. The following key comments are of relevance:

- The site planning and elements where discretion is being sought are primarily the result of the irregular lot shape and site characteristics.
- The design response of the proposed development has been guided by adjoining properties to the north and south along Auckland Street. This has informed street setbacks to the ground floor and the siting of two storey and single storey building height on the property, in order to moderate the impact of the proposed development on the streetscape and these adjoining properties.
- The upper floor of the proposed development is stepped back from the ground floor and with differing design treatments. This is to distinguish between the ground and upper floors, and to assist in reducing the impacts of building bulk.
- The outdoor living area is located adjacent to the main living space to ensure it is useable, and exceeds the deemed-to-comply area and minimum dimension of the R Codes to ensure it is functional.
- The development site would be provided with deep soil and planting areas as well as canopy coverage that would exceed the deemed-to-comply standards of the Built Form Policy. The proposed deep soil and planting areas within the front setback area is intended to provide for 10 trees to be planted. This would present a landscaped interface to the street, tying into the heavily landscaped Gill Street Car Park located directly across the road from the subject site.
- The proposed northern boundary wall would abut an approved boundary wall that is currently being constructed on the northern adjoining property. It would not extend forward of this wall so would not be visible from the street. The proposed adjacent ground floor building wall is 3.3 metres in length. These walls would not affect the amenity of the adjoining northern property.

A more detailed assessment against the discretionary aspects of the application is set out below. These relate to consideration against the R Codes and Built Form Policy.

Street Setback

The diagram below shows the area of the site that could be developed for buildings in considering the deemed-to-comply street setback area and the sewerage easement located to the rear boundary of the site. This developable area is approximately 27 percent of the site. In considering this, the proposal seeks discretion to develop forward of the street setback line.



The proposed primary street setbacks would satisfy the [Design Principles](#) of the R Codes and [Local Housing Objectives](#) of the Built Form Policy for the following reasons:

- Setbacks in the Surrounding Streetscape:
 - Streetscape Setting: The existing surrounding streetscape comprises of one and two storey Federation style and modern houses. A car park is located directly across Auckland Street from the subject site. The diagram below shows the varying street setbacks of existing nearby properties. Some properties to the south of the subject site and on the same eastern side of Auckland Street as the subject site are capable of subdivision given their lot size. This means that they are capable of redevelopment and infill in the future, and this would likely have an influence on the established street setbacks.



- Interface to Adjoining Northern Property: The proposed dwelling has been designed to be so that it does not protrude forward of the approved dwelling at the property located immediately to the north and to read as being consistent with the streetscape pattern for that site. The adjoining property to the north (No. 31 Gill Street) is currently undergoing construction for a two storey dwelling with a two car garage abutting the shared lot boundary with the subject site. For this adjoining property, the approved garage street setback is 2.6 metres and dwelling street setback is 2.7 metres. The proposed development has a minimum garage street setback of 3.4 metres and minimum dwelling street setback of 2.9 metres. The proposed garage boundary wall would abut the approved garage boundary wall on the northern property and does not protrude forward of this.
- Interface to Adjoining Southern Property: The proposed dwelling has been designed to provide a sense of openness and reduced building bulk to transition street setbacks to the adjoining property to the south (No. 78 Auckland Street). No. 78 Auckland Street features a federation style single storey dwelling with a single garage and carport, with the carport located to the shared lot boundary with the subject site and setback 6.5 metres from the street. The subject site has a boundary length of 10.0 metres to this side of the lot which limits the ability to set any building back consistent with the carport at No. 78 Auckland Street. The design response for the proposed development is to incorporate a single storey, open sided alfresco at the southern interface. This proposed alfresco is setback 3.0 metres from the street boundary and 1.4 metres from the side lot boundary. The stepping down of height on the subject site to this southern interface and open sided nature of the alfresco assists in creating a sense of separation and openness with the adjoining property and in transitioning the street setback.

- Gill Street Car Park: The car park located on the opposite side of Auckland Street from the subject site is void of buildings and presents a landscaped interface to the street. The proposed development provides for deep soil and planting areas within the front setback area and the proposed planting of 10 trees within these areas. This would assist in presenting a landscaped interface to the street and to soften the view of the dwelling. This would be supplemented by the three existing street trees in the Auckland Street verge in front of the subject site.
- Building Bulk: The combination of the following elements provides articulation and visual interest to the street, while reducing solid blank walls and associated building bulk impacts:
 - Building Design: The building mass and bulk as presented to the street has been broken up through articulation with varying setbacks of the building horizontally and setting back of the upper floor; incorporation of glazing, roof overhangs and eaves; design detailing and minor projections; and the use of varying colours and materials.
 - Garage Presentation: The proposed garage is set back 0.5 metres behind the dwelling and meets the deemed-to-comply standard of the Built Form Policy in respect to garage placement relative to dwelling alignment. The proposed garage also occupies approximately 26 percent of the lot width, less than the permitted 50 percent deemed-to-comply standard of the Built Form Policy.
- Building Scale: The proposed dwelling has been designed to transition between the two storey dwelling under construction to the north at No. 31 Gill Street and a single storey dwelling to the south at No. 78 Auckland Street. The consolidation of two storey elements away from the southern lot boundary ensures that siting of two storeys on the subject site would be of a comparable scale to the development at No. 31 Gill Street. The subject site also slopes down from north to south which means that siting the two storey elements of the proposed dwelling away from the southern lot boundary would assist in impacts to the neighbouring single storey dwelling located to the south.
- Surveillance: The proposed dwelling presents windows to habitable rooms across the façade of the dwelling facing the street, at both ground and upper floor level. These windows facing the street and visually permeable fencing to the street enhances active and passive surveillance opportunities to both the street and public car parking area on the opposite side of Auckland Street.

Lot Boundary Setback/ Boundary Wall

The lot boundary setbacks would satisfy the [Design Principles](#) of the R Codes and [Local Housing Objectives](#) of the Built Form Policy for the following reasons:

- Lot Boundary Setback:
 - Building Bulk: The proposed lot boundary setback relates to a 3.3 metre portion of wall on the ground floor to the Bed/ Study that incorporates a door. The short length of the wall reduces the bulk impact of the wall, which would be largely screened from view to the northern adjoining property by a future dividing fence. The proposed building wall is located adjacent to the approved 'services court' with access from the laundry for clothes drying on the northern adjoining property.
 - Visual Privacy Impacts: The proposed lot boundary setback would not result in overlooking of the adjoining northern property and complies with the visual privacy standards of the R Codes. This is because the wall is to the ground floor and does not incorporate any major openings that would overlook the adjoining property.
 - Ventilation: The proposed 1.2 metre northern lot boundary setback would allow sufficient space for air flow to allow for cross-ventilation of both the subject site and adjoining property. This is also in considering the 2.5 metre setback of the approved dwelling on the northern property to the common boundary.
- Boundary Wall: The proposed boundary wall would abut the approved boundary wall to the northern adjoining property and would not project forward of this into the front setback area. This would mitigate the impact of the boundary wall location within front setback area and ensure that it does not add additional bulk as viewed from the street. The boundary wall would not result in a reduction of light and ventilation to the adjoining property given it is abutting their approved garage, and due to its location would not adversely impact the amenity of the adjoining property.
- Solar Access: The location of the subject lot boundary setback wall and boundary wall are to the northern boundary. This means that the shadow cast from these walls would fall onto the subject site itself and not onto the adjoining northern property.

Outdoor Living Areas

The proposed outdoor living area would satisfy the [Design Principles](#) of the R Codes for the following reasons:

- **Usability and Accessibility:** The outdoor living area exceeds the deemed-to-comply area of 30 square metres and minimum dimension of 4 metres. The outdoor living area is also readily accessible from the kitchen, dining and living room spaces and is able to be used in conjunction with these primary living spaces.
- **Solar Access and Ventilation:** The covered portion of the outdoor living area is located to the south of the dwelling and does not impact solar access into the dwelling. The open sided design of the covered portion of the outdoor living area presents minimal impact to natural ventilation for the dwelling. The uncovered portion of the outdoor living area also enables adequate access to sunlight and ventilation into living spaces of the dwelling.
- **Landscaping:** The outdoor living area would be co-located with deep soil areas and landscaping on the site.
- **Orientation:** The outdoor living area is oriented with an eastern and northern aspect of the site.
- **Surveillance:** The outdoor living area would facilitate street surveillance between the dwelling and the street. The proposed development meets the deemed-to-comply requirements for street surveillance as well as street walls and fences, with no visually impermeable fence extending above 0.6 metres in height.

Landscaping

In addition to the deemed-to-comply standards of the R Codes, the application has also been assessed against the landscaping provisions of the Built Form Policy. The deemed-to-comply landscaping standards set out in the Built Form Policy have not yet been approved by the Western Australian Planning Commission. As such, these provisions are given regard only in the assessment of the application and do not have the same weight as other policy provisions. The proposed development meets the deemed-to-comply requirements of the Built Form Policy.

The proposed landscaping would satisfy the [Design Principles](#) of the R Codes and [Local Housing Objectives](#) of the Built Form Policy for the following reasons:

- **Deep Soil and Planting Areas:** 19.2 percent of the site with a minimum dimension of 1 metre would be provided as deep soil and planting areas, greater than the 12 percent deep soil and 3 percent planting areas set out under the deemed-to-comply standards of the Built Form Policy. There are also additional landscaping areas less than 1 metre in dimension that would be provided on-site. These areas would provide for adequate planting across the site.
- **Tree Planting Location and Species:**
 - 15 trees and other plantings are proposed to be planted within deep soil and planting areas within the front setback area and to lot boundaries. This meets the deemed-to-comply standard of the Built Form Policy in respect to canopy coverage. This would assist in reducing the impact of the development on the adjoining residential properties and to the street, and would make an effective contribution to the landscaping outcome and canopy coverage on site.
 - The 10 trees proposed to be planted within the front setback area would assist in softening the view of the development as viewed from Auckland Street. There are also three existing street trees in the Auckland Street verge adjacent to the property and which would be retained.
 - The City's Parks team supports the tree species proposed. Further consideration is required to confirm the appropriate spacing between the trees to be planted to ensure it maximises canopy coverage and is viable. It is recommended that an updated landscaping plan be provided as a condition of approval to confirm tree planting and groundcover specifications, details and spacing.
- **Environmental Benefits:** The proposed plantings and deep soil areas would contribute towards increased urban air quality, tree and vegetation coverage and a sense of open space between the subject site and adjoining properties. This would provide landscaping amenity for residents and would make an effective contribution to the City's green canopy to assist in reducing the impact of the urban heat island effect.

Environmentally Sustainable Design (ESD)

Clause 5.11 of the Built Form Policy relating to environmentally sustainable design (ESD) sets out local housing objectives to be achieved and does not prescribe deemed-to-comply standards. The Built Form Policy ESD standards have not been approved by the WAPC and in the assessment of the application is given regard only which means that it does not have the same weight as other policy provisions.

The applicant has submitted an environmentally sustainable design template in support of the application. It identifies the below built form and site planning measures that have been incorporated into the proposed development and that would satisfy the intended outcomes of the Built Form Policy in respect to environmentally sustainable design.

- Incorporating the use of recycled bricks, lighter coloured roof and external walls, double brick walls and ceiling insulation to improve thermal performance of the dwelling.
- Roof space has been kept clear of fixtures, plants and equipment to maximise space for installation of solar panels in the future as intended by the owner.
- The proposed development incorporates shading devices via eaves and roof overhangs over most windows to reduce unwanted solar gain in summer and increase passive solar gain in winter. This includes to western facing windows.
- Operable windows to habitable spaces to allow for natural cross-ventilation.
- The proposed single house is east-west oriented and achieves 55 percent open space, minimising the extent of the building footprint to provide for landscaping and tree planting areas.
- Water efficient toilets, plumbing fixtures and energy efficient appliances to be installed.

**CITY OF VINCENT
LOCAL PLANNING SCHEME NO. 2
SCHEME MAP 1 - LEEDERVILLE**

LEGEND

METROPOLITAN REGION SCHEME RESERVES

Note: The Western Australian Planning Commission care of the Department of Planning should be consulted for full information on the actual land requirements for all Metropolitan Region Scheme Reserves.

- PARKS AND RECREATION**
- R Restricted Public Access
- PRIMARY REGIONAL ROADS RESERVATION**
- OTHER REGIONAL ROADS RESERVATION**
- RAILWAYS**
- PUBLIC PURPOSES**
Particular use denoted as follows:
- H Hospital
- HS High School
- TS Technical School
- CP Car Park
- U University
- CG Commonwealth Government
- SU Special Use
- WSD Water Authority of Western Australia
- P Prison

CITY OF VINCENT LOCAL SCHEME RESERVES

- PUBLIC OPEN SPACE**
- R Restricted
- PUBLIC PURPOSES**
Particular use denoted as follows:
- PS Primary School
- CP Car Park
- CU Civic Uses
- HS High School
- I Institute for the Deaf
- W Water Supply Sewerage and Drainage
- TS Technical School

CITY OF VINCENT SCHEME ZONES


- RESIDENTIAL**
- MIXED USE**
- COMMERCIAL**
- LOCAL CENTRE**
- DISTRICT CENTRE**
- REGIONAL CENTRE**
- SPECIAL USE**
Particular use denoted as follows:
- CP Car Park
- CU Community Use
- FC Function Centre
- HC Hall and Non Residential Club
- H Hotel
- PW Place of Worship
- S Service Station

ADDITIONAL USE

- ADDITIONAL USE**

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION & RESIDENTIAL PLANNING CODES

- CODE AREA BOUNDARY**
- SCHEME AREA BOUNDARY**
- DENSITY CODE**




CITY OF VINCENT

The City of Vincent does not warrant the accuracy of information in this publication and any person using or relying upon such information does so on the basis that the City of Vincent shall bear no responsibility or liability whatsoever for any errors, faults, defects or omissions in the information. Includes layers based on information provided by and with the permission of the Western Australian Land Information Authority (Landgate) (2013).

Consultation and Location Map
No. 80 Auckland Street, North Perth

Extent of Consultation





CITY OF VINCENT


The City of Vincent does not warrant the accuracy of information in this publication and any person using or relying upon such information does so on the basis that the City of Vincent shall bear no responsibility or liability whatsoever for any errors, faults, defects or omissions in the information. Includes layers based on information provided by and with the permission of the Western Australian Land Information Authority (Landgate) (2013).

No. 80 Auckland Street, North Perth



This Drawing is to be read in conjunction with all relevant Drawings related to the Project for accurate co-ordination of services. The Contractor is to check all dimensions on site before the commencement of work. Should any discrepancies occur, notify the Builder immediately. These Drawings remain the property of the Builder and shall be returned upon request.

LOT 102




DISCLAIMER:
Lot boundaries drawn on survey are based on landgate plan only. Survey does not include title search and as such may not show easements or other interests not shown on plan. Title should be checked to verify all lot details and for any easements or other interests which may affect building on the property.

DISCLAIMER:
Survey does not include verification of cadastral boundaries. All features and levels shown are based on orientation to existing pegs and fences only which may not be on correct cadastral alignment. Any designs based or dependent on the location of existing features should have those features' location verified in relation to the true boundary.

DISCLAIMER:
Survey shows visible features only and will not show locations of underground pipes or conduits for internal or mains services. Verification of the location of all internal and mains services should be confirmed prior to finalisation of any design work.

DISCLAIMER:
Cottage & Engineering surveys accept no responsibility for any physical on site changes to this survey including any adjoining neighbours levels and features that have occurred after the date on this survey. All Sewer details plotted from information supplied by Water Corporation.



LOT MISCLOSE
0.010 m



DISCLAIMER:
HIGH TENSION POWER LINES. CHECK TITLE FOR EASEMENTS AND WESTERN POWER FOR SET-BACKS.


NOTE:
TELSTRA COMM. PIT NOT LOCATED ADJACENT TO LOT AT TIME OF SURVEY. VERIFY AVAILABILITY WITH TELSTRA.

⊕	Power Dome
⊙	Power Pole
⊕ (C)	Phone Pits
⊕ (W)	Water Conn.
(TP 10.00)	Top Pillar/Post
(TR 10.00)	Top Wall
(TF 10.00)	Top Retaining
(TF 10.00)	Top Fence


Riverstone Custom Homes

CONTOUR & FEATURE SURVEY

LOT Lot 102 (DP 413590)
ADDRESS #80 Auckland Street, North Perth
LGA CITY OF VINCENT
GPS Lat: -31.919436 Long: 115.845926
SSA No **AREA** 353m² **VOL.** 2963 **FOL.** 981




ELEC.	U/Ground / O/Head	SEWER	Yes	ROADS	Bitumen	COASTAL	No
GAS	Check Alinta	COMMS	Not loc.	PATH	Concrete	SOIL	Sand
WATER	Yes	DRAINAGE	Good	KERBS	Non-Mount / Nil	VEG.	Light Grass Cover



COTTAGE SURVEYS
LICENSED SURVEYORS

87-89 Guthrie St
Osborne Park WA 6017
PO Box 1611
Osborne Park BC WA 6917
P: (08) 9446 7361
E: perth@cottage.com.au
W: www.cottage.com.au

JOB: 528347 **DATE:** 24 Jun 22 **DRAWN:** J. Genovese



Existing Site Plan Scale: 1:200

© Copyright 2005 Water Corporation
The Water Corporation has taken due care in the preparation of the data comprised on this map but accepts no responsibility for any inaccuracy of facility, cadastral or other information provided nor inappropriate use of this information. The user is reminded that under no circumstances can the information here displayed be copied, altered, modified or otherwise published in any form including the internet without express permission of the Water Corporation. The Water Corporation should be advised of any intention to carry out any physical activities within proximity to facilities displayed on this map. If any inaccuracies are found with this information

Amended Plan

CITY OF VINCENT RECEIVED
2 June 2023



A: Suite 44 Cottesloe Central Shopping Centre, 460 Stirling Highway, Peppermint Grove, WA 6011
T: 08 9284 4866 F: 08 9284 6144 E: reception@riverstone.com.au
W: www.riverstone.com.au
© Copyright. This drawing and design is copyright and may not be reproduced or copied in whole or in part without the express written permission of Riverstone Custom Homes.

Barbas Residence
Lot 102 #80 Auckland Street,
North Perth, WA 6006

Wind Classification T.B.C
Amendments:
DA05 - Council Tweaks-S.MC-31/05/23
DA05 - Garge setback increased-S.MC-23/05/23
DA04-W09 changed to Minor opening-S.MC-22-05-
DA03 - FF Bath room Layout changed as per Council's requirements - D2-24/04/23
DA02 - Redesign as per Alan's Sketch-D2-27/03/23
Plot Date: 1/06/2023 at 9:29 AM

Signatures:
Client: _____
Client: _____
Builder: _____


Site Plan - Existing

Rev No. **DA06**
Job No. **5109**
Drawn By **2.01**

This Drawing is to be read in conjunction with all relevant Drawings related to the Project for accurate co-ordination of services. The Contractor is to check all dimensions on site before the commencement of work. Should any discrepancies occur, notify the Builder immediately. These Drawings remain the property of the Builder and shall be returned upon request.

Planning application

Area Calculations		
Name	Area	Perimeter
0 Ground Floor		
Alfresco	19.2	18,292.0
Garage	43.4	28,180.0
Ground Floor	115.0	58,250.0
	177.6 m²	104,722.0 m
1 First Floor		
Balcony	4.6	9,509.6
First Floor	129.2	57,430.3
	133.8 m²	66,939.9 m
	311.4 m²	171,661.9 m



Site Plan Scale: 1:100

Amended Plan

CITY OF VINCENT RECEIVED
2 June 2023

RIVERSTONE

A: Suite 44 Cottesloe Central Shopping Centre, 460 Stirling Highway, Pepperment Grove, WA 6011
 T: 08 9284 4866 F: 08 9284 6144 E: reception@riverstone.com.au
 W: www.riverstone.com.au
 © Copyright. This drawing and design is copyright and may not be reproduced or copied in whole or in part without the express written permission of Riverstone Custom Homes.

Barbas Residence
 Lot 102 #80 Auckland Street,
 North Perth, WA 6006

Wind Classification T.B.C
 Amendments: DA05_Council Tweaks-S.MC-31/05/23
 DA05_Garage setback increased-S.MC-23/05/23
 DA04-WO9 changed to Minor opening-S.MC-22-05-
 DA03 - FF Bath room Layout changed as per Council's requirements - D2-24/04/23
 DA02 - Redesign as per Allan's Sketch-D2-27/03/23

Signatures:
 Client: _____
 Client: _____
 Builder: _____


Site Plan - New DA06

Job No. 5109
 Rev No. 2.03
 N/A.

This Drawing is to be read in conjunction with all relevant Drawings related to the Project for accurate co-ordination of services. The Contractor is to check all dimensions on site before the commencement of work. Should any discrepancies occur, notify the Builder immediately. These Drawings remain the property of the Builder and shall be returned upon request.

Planning application

Area Calculations		
Name	Area	Perimeter
0 Ground Floor		
Alfresco	19.2	18,292.0
Garage	43.4	28,180.0
Ground Floor	115.0	58,250.0
	177.6 m²	104,722.0 m
1 First Floor		
Balcony	4.6	9,509.6
First Floor	129.2	57,430.3
	133.8 m²	66,939.9 m
	311.4 m²	171,661.9 m



Ground Floor Scale: 1:100

LEGEND

- Smoke Alarm - Hard Wired, Interlinked and to AS 3786-2014
- Exhaust fan - flumed to external air and not into the roof space.
- Wall mounted cold water hose tap
- Water supply for fridge
- Gas bayonet point

COMPLIANCE NOTES

Artificial Lighting | To comply with NCC Vol. 2 Part 3.12.5.5

Fall Prevention | Bedroom windows - where floor is 2m more than surface beneath unless opening sash is greater than 1700mm AFL opening must be permanently restricted to 125mm or fitted with a non-removable robust screen.

All other windows - where the fall height is 4m or greater must have a transom above 865mm and a sill height less than 150mm - No restriction is required to opening.
Refer to NCC V2 Part 3.9.2.6 and 3.9.2.7

Boundary Walls To Provide Fire Separation | To comply with NCC Vol.2 Part 3.7.3.2

Fireplace | To comply with NCC Vol.2 Part 3.10.7

Parapet/Boundary Fireproofing | To comply with NCC Vol.2 Part 3.7.2.4

Staircase, Balustrade and Handrails | To comply with NCC Vol. 2 Part 3.9.1 and 3.9.2 (Nom. 280 Going x 172 Riser).

Stormwater Drainage | To comply with NCC V2 Part 3.1.3 citing AS 3500.3

Swimming Pool Barriers | To comply with AS 1926.1 and 1926.2

Timber Framing | To comply with AS 1684

Termite Protection | All primary building elements used for the construction of this building will consist entirely of, or a combination of, materials considered not subject to termite attack. Specifically, all timbers used in this dwelling will be preservative treated in accordance with AS 3660.1 and will comply with Part 3.1.4.2 of the Building Code of Australia - Volume 2, 2019 Amendment 1.


Parapet Walls | FMC Homeguard as physical Termite barrier as per AS 3660.1 - 2014 and will comply with Part 3.1.4.2 of the Building Code of Australia - Volume 2, 2019 Amendment 1

Wet areas | To comply with NCC Vol.2 Part 3.8.1

Steelwork | Exposed steel shall have an anti-corrosive treatment in accordance with the NCC 2019

CITY OF VINCENT RECEIVED
2 June 2023

Amended Plan



A: Suite 44 Cottesloe Central Shopping Centre, 460 Stirling Highway, Peppermint Grove, WA 6011
T: 08 9284 4866 F: 08 9284 6144 E: reception@riverstone.com.au
W: www.riverstone.com.au
© Copyright. This drawing and design is copyright and may not be reproduced or copied in whole or in part without the express written permission of Riverstone Custom Homes.

Barbas Residence
Lot 102 #80 Auckland Street,
North Perth, WA 6006

Wind Classification	T.B.C	Amendments:
Local Authority	City of Vincent	DA05 - Council Tweaks-S.MCC-31/05/23
Drawn:	Daniel Zhao	DA05 - Garge setback increased-S.MCC-23/05/23
Plot Date:	1/06/2023 at 9:29 AM	DA04-W09 changed to Minor opening-S.MCC-22-05-23
		DA03 - FF Bath room Layout changed as per Council's requirements - D2-24/04/23
		DA02 - Redesignated as per Alan's Sketch-D2-27/03/23


Signatures:	Rev. No.	Rev. Date
Client:	5109	N/A.
Client:	2.04	
Builder:		

Ground Floor DA06

This Drawing is to be read in conjunction with all relevant Drawings related to the Project for accurate co-ordination of services. The Contractor is to check all dimensions on site before the commencement of work. Should any discrepancies occur, notify the Builder immediately. These Drawings remain the property of the Builder and shall be returned upon request.

Planning application

Area Calculations		
Name	Area	Perimeter
0 Ground Floor		
Allfresco	19.2	18,292.0
Garage	43.4	28,180.0
Ground Floor	115.0	58,250.0
	177.6 m²	104,722.0 m
1 First Floor		
Balcony	4.6	9,509.6
First Floor	129.2	57,430.3
	133.8 m²	66,939.9 m
	311.4 m²	171,661.9 m




First Floor Scale: 1:100

LEGEND	
	Smoke Alarm - Hard Wired, Interlinked and to AS 3786-2014
	Exhaust fan - flumed to external air and not into the roof space.
	Wall mounted cold water hose tap
	Water supply for fridge
	Gas bayonet point

COMPLIANCE NOTES	
Artificial Lighting To comply with NCC Vol. 2 Part 3.12.5.5	
Fall Prevention Bedroom windows - where floor is 2m more than surface beneath unless opening sash is greater than 1700mm AFL opening must be permanently restricted to 125mm or fitted with a non-removable robust screen.	
All other windows - where the fall height is 4m or greater must have a transom above 865mm and a sill height less than 150mm - No restriction is required to opening. Refer to NCC V2 Part 3.9.2.6 and 3.9.2.7	
Boundary Walls To Provide Fire Separation To comply with NCC Vol.2 Part 3.7.3.2	
Fireplace To comply with NCC Vol.2 Part 3.10.7	
Parapet/Boundary Fireproofing To comply with NCC Vol.2 Part 3.7.2.4	
Staircase, Balustrade and Handrails To comply with NCC Vol. 2 Part 3.9.1 and 3.9.2 (Nom. 280 Going x 172 Riser).	
Stormwater Drainage To comply with NCC V2 Part 3.1.3 citing AS 3500.3	
Swimming Pool Barriers To comply with AS 1926.1 and 1926.2	
Timber Framing To comply with AS 1684	
Termite Protection All primary building elements used for the construction of this building will consist entirely of, or a combination of, materials considered not subject to termite attack. Specifically, all timbers used in this dwelling will be preservative treated in accordance with AS 3660.1 and will comply with Part 3.1.4.2 of the Building Code of Australia - Volume 2, 2019 Amendment 1.	
Parapet Walls FMC Homeguard as physical Termite barrier as per AS 3660.1 - 2014 and will comply with Part 3.1.4.2 of the Building Code of Australia - Volume 2, 2019 Amendment 1	
Wet areas To comply with NCC Vol.2 Part 3.8.1	
Steelwork Exposed steel shall have an anti-corrosive treatment in accordance with the NCC 2019	

CITY OF VINCENT
RECEIVED
2 June 2023

Amended Plan



A: Suite 44 Cottesloe Central Shopping Centre, 460 Stirling Highway, Peppermint Grove, WA 6011
T: 08 9284 4866 F: 08 9284 6144 E: reception@riverstone.com.au
W: www.riverstone.com.au
© Copyright. This drawing and design is copyright and may not be reproduced or copied in whole or in part without the express written permission of Riverstone Custom Homes.



Barbas Residence
Lot 102 #80 Auckland Street,
North Perth, WA 6006

Wind Classification	T.B.C	Amendments:
Local Authority	City of Vincent	DA05 - Council Tweaks-S.MCC-31/05/23
Dwn:	Daniel Zhao	DA05 - Garge setback increased-S.MCC-23/05/23
Plot Date:	1/06/2023 at 9:29 AM	DA04-W09 changed to Minor opening-S.MCC-22-05-23
		DA03 - FF Bath room Layout changed as per Council's requirements - D2-24/04/23
		DA02 - Redesign as per Alan's Sketch-D2-27/03/23

Signatures:	Rev No.	Rev	Rev
Client:	5109	N/A.	
Client:	2.05		
Builder:			

First Floor DA06

This Drawing is to be read in conjunction with all relevant Drawings related to the Project for accurate co-ordination of services. The Contractor is to check all dimensions on site before the commencement of work. Should any discrepancies occur, notify the Builder immediately. These Drawings remain the property of the Builder and shall be returned upon request.



Eaves Overhang 1:20

LEGEND	
	Smoke Alarm - Hard Wired, Interlinked and to AS 3786-2014
	Exhaust fan - flumed to external air and not into the roof space.
	Wall mounted cold water hose tap
	Water supply for fridge
	Gas bayonet point

COMPLIANCE NOTES	
Artificial Lighting	To comply with NCC Vol. 2 Part 3.12.5.5
Fall Prevention Bedroom windows	- where floor is 2m more than surface beneath unless opening sash is greater than 1700mm AFL opening must be permanently restricted to 125mm or fitted with a non-removable robust screen.
All other windows	- where the fall height is 4m or greater must have a transom above 865mm and a sill height less than 150mm - No restriction is required to opening. Refer to NCC V2 Part 3.9.2.6 and 3.9.2.7
Boundary Walls To Provide Fire Separation	To comply with NCC Vol.2 Part 3.7.3.2
Fireplace	To comply with NCC Vol.2 Part 3.10.7
Parapet/Boundary Fireproofing	To comply with NCC Vol.2 Part 3.7.2.4
Staircase, Balustrade and Handrails	To comply with NCC Vol. 2 Part 3.9.1 and 3.9.2 (Nom. 280 Going x 172 Riser).
Stormwater Drainage	To comply with NCC V2 Part 3.1.3 citing AS 3500.3
Swimming Pool Barriers	To comply with AS 1926.1 and 1926.2
Timber Framing	To comply with AS 1684
Termite Protection	All primary building elements used for the construction of this building will consist entirely of, or a combination of, materials considered not subject to termite attack. Specifically, all timbers used in this dwelling will be preservative treated in accordance with AS 3660.1 and will comply with Part 3.1.4.2 of the Building Code of Australia - Volume 2, 2019 Amendment 1.
Parapet Walls	FMC Homeguard as physical Termite barrier as per AS 3660.1 - 2014 and will comply with Part 3.1.4.2 of the Building Code of Australia - Volume 2, 2019 Amendment 1
Wet areas	To comply with NCC Vol.2 Part 3.8.1
Steelwork	Exposed steel shall have an anti-corrosive treatment in accordance with the NCC 2019


CITY OF VINCENT RECEIVED
2 June 2023

Amended Plan


Roof Plan DA06

	A: Suite 44 Cottesloe Central Shopping Centre, 460 Stirling Highway, Peppermint Grove, WA 6011 T: 08 9284 4866 F: 08 9284 6144 E: reception@riverstone.com.au W: www.riverstone.com.au © Copyright. This drawing and design is copyright and may not be reproduced or copied in whole or in part without the express written permission of Riverstone Custom Homes.	Barbas Residence Lot 102 #80 Auckland Street, North Perth, WA 6006	Wind Classification: T.B.C. Local Authority: City of Vincent Dwn: Daniel Zhao Plot Date: 1/06/2023 at 9:29 AM	Amendments: DA05 - Council Tweaks-S.MCC-31/05/23 DA05 - Garge setback increased-S.MCC-23/05/23 DA04-WO9 changed to Minor opening-S.MCC-22-05-23 DA03 - FF Bath room Layout changed as per Council's requirements - D2-24/04/23 DA02 - Redesign as per Allan's Sketch-D2-27/03/23	Signatures: Client: _____ Client: _____ Builder: _____
			Job No: 5109 Rev No: 2.06 Date: N/A.		

This Drawing is to be read in conjunction with all relevant Drawings related to the Project for accurate co-ordination of services. The Contractor is to check all dimensions on site before the commencement of work. Should any discrepancies occur, notify the Builder immediately. These Drawings remain the property of the Builder and shall be returned upon request.




E/01a West Scale: 1:100
2.04



E/01b West 1:100
2.04

Note!
Bedroom windows - where floor is 2m more than surface beneath unless opening sash is greater than 1700mm AFL opening must be permanently restricted to 125mm or fitted with a non-removable robust screen.
All other windows - where the fall height is 4m or greater must have a transom above 965mm and a sill height less than 150mm - No restriction is required to opening.
 Refer to NCC V2 Part 3.9.2.6.



E/02 South Scale: 1:100
2.04

CITY OF VINCENT
 RECEIVED
 2 June 2023

Amended Plan



A: Suite 44 Cottesloe Central Shopping Centre, 460 Stirling Highway, Peppermint Grove, WA 6011
 T: 08 9284 4866 F: 08 9284 6144 E: reception@riverstone.com.au
 W: www.riverstone.com.au
 © Copyright. This drawing and design is copyright and may not be reproduced or copied in whole or in part without the express written permission of Riverstone Custom Homes.

Barbas Residence
 Lot 102 #80 Auckland Street,
 North Perth, WA 6006

Wind Classification T.B.C.
 Local Authority City of Vincent
 City of Vincent
 Daniel Zhao
 Plot Date 1/06/2023 at 9:29 AM

Amendments:
 DA05 - Council Tweaks-S.MCC-31/05/23
 DA05 - Garage setback increased-S.MCC-23/05/23
 DA04-W09 changed to Minor opening-S.MCC-22-05-23
 DA03 - FF Bath room Layout changed as per Council's requirements - D2-24/04/23
 DA02 - Redesignated as per Allan's Sketch-D2-27/03/23

Signatures:
 Client: _____
 Client: _____
 Builder: _____

Elevations - DA06

N/A.


5109

4.01


Ren No. Job No. Plot No.

This Drawing is to be read in conjunction with all relevant Drawings related to the Project for accurate co-ordination of services. The Contractor is to check all dimensions on site before the commencement of work. Should any discrepancies occur, notify the Builder immediately. These Drawings remain the property of the Builder and shall be returned upon request.

Note!
Bedroom windows - where floor is 2m more than surface beneath unless opening sash is greater than 1700mm AFL opening must be permanently restricted to 125mm or fitted with a non-removable robust screen.
All other windows - where the fall height is 4m or greater must have a transom above 865mm and a sill height less than 150mm - No restriction is required to opening.
 Refer to NCC V2 Part 3.9.2.6.




E/03
2.04
 East Scale: 1:100



E/04a
2.04
 North 1:100

Note!
Bedroom windows - where floor is 2m more than surface beneath unless opening sash is greater than 1700mm AFL opening must be permanently restricted to 125mm or fitted with a non-removable robust screen.
All other windows - where the fall height is 4m or greater must have a transom above 865mm and a sill height less than 150mm - No restriction is required to opening.
 Refer to NCC V2 Part 3.9.2.6.



E/04b
2.04
 North Scale: 1:100

Amended Plan

CITY OF VINCENT
 RECEIVED
 2 June 2023

A: Suite 44 Cottesloe Central Shopping Centre, 460 Stirling Highway, Peppermint Grove, WA 6011
 T: 08 9284 4866 F: 08 9284 6144 E: reception@riverstone.com.au
 W: www.riverstone.com.au
 © Copyright. This drawing and design is copyright and may not be reproduced or copied in whole or in part without the express written permission of Riverstone Custom Homes.

Barbas Residence
 Lot 102 #80 Auckland Street,
 North Perth, WA 6006

Wind Classification: T.B.C.
 Local Authority: City of Vincent
 Dwn: Daniel Zhao
 Plot Date: 1/06/2023 at 9:29 AM
 Amendments:
 DA05 - Council Tweaks-S.MCC-31/05/23
 DA05 - Garage setback increased-S.MCC-23/05/23
 DA04-W09 changed to Minor opening-S.MCC-22-05-23
 DA03 - FF Bath room Layout changed as per Council's requirements - D2-24/04/23
 DA02 - Redesign as per Allan's Sketch-D2-27/03/23


Signatures:
 Client:
 Client:
 Builder:

Elevations - DA06

Rev No. Job No. 5109
 Job No. 4.02
 N/A.

RIVERSTONE


This Drawing is to be read in conjunction with all relevant Drawings related to the Project for accurate co-ordination of services. The Contractor is to check all dimensions on site before the commencement of work. Should any discrepancies occur, notify the Builder immediately. These Drawings remain the property of the Builder and shall be returned upon request.



S/01
2.04

Section


1:100



S/02
2.04

Section

1:100



S/03
2.04

Section

Scale: 1:100

Amended Plan

CITY OF VINCENT
RECEIVED
2 June 2023

A: Suite 44 Cottesloe Central Shopping Centre, 460 Stirling Highway,
Peppermint Grove, WA 6011
T: 08 9284 4866 F: 08 9284 6144 E: reception@riverstone.com.au
W: www.riverstone.com.au
© Copyright. This drawing and design is copyright and may not be
reproduced or copied in whole or in part without the express written
permission of Riverstone Custom Homes.

Barbas Residence
Lot 102 #80 Auckland Street,
North Perth, WA 6006

Wind Classification	T.B.C	Amendments:
Local Authority	City of Vincent	DA06 - Council Tweaks-S.MC-31/05/23
Dwn:	Daniel Zhao	DA05 - Garge setback increased-S.MC-23/05/23
Plot Date:	1/06/2023 at 9:29 AM	DA04 - WC9 changed to Minor opening-S.MC-22-05-23
		DA03 - FF Bath room Layout changed as per Council's requirements - D2-24/04/23
		T402 - Redesign as per Allan's Sketch-D2-27/03/23

Signatures:
Client: _____
Client: _____
Builder: _____

Sections DA06

N/A.








5109

5.01

RIVERSTONE

#80 Auckland Street, North Perth

External colours and materials:

Exterior	Product	Colour	Image
Window frames	Colorbond	White lustre	
Walls	Rendered paint finish	Dulux Terrace white	
	Contrast render on rear wall	Dulux Wallaby	
	Recycled facebrick	Restoration red	
	Painted timber	Dulux white on white Balustrade, feature Posts, and frieze	
Roofing & Gutters	Colorbond	Wallaby	
Downpipes	Colorbond	Shale grey	

Barges

Paint finish

Dulux White on White




Floor

Exposed poured concrete

BGC standard A125



This Drawing is to be read in conjunction with all relevant Drawings related to the Project for accurate co-ordination of services. The Contractor is to check all dimensions on site before the commencement of work. Should any discrepancies occur, notify the Builder immediately. These Drawings remain the property of the Builder and shall be returned upon request.



Site Plan - Landscaping

Scale: 1:100

Amended Plan

CITY OF VINCENT
RECEIVED
2 June 2023



A: Suite 44 Cottesloe Central Shopping Centre, 460 Stirling Highway,
Peppermint Grove, WA 6011
T: 08 9284 4866 F: 08 9284 6144 E: reception@riverstone.com.au
W: www.riverstone.com.au
© Copyright. This drawing and design is copyright and may not be
reproduced or copied in whole or in part without the express written
permission of Riverstone Custom Homes.

Barbas Residence
Lot 102 #80 Auckland Street,
North Perth, WA 6006

Wind Classification T.B.C
Local Authority City of Vincent
Dwn: Daniel Zhao
Plot Date: 1/06/2023 at 9:29 AM
Amendments:
DA06_Council Tweaks-S.MC-31/05/23
DA05_Garage setback increased-S.MC-23/05/23
DA04-WO9 changed to Minor opening-S.MC-22-05-23
DA03 - FF Bath room Layout changed as per Council's requirements - D2-24/04/23
DA02 - Redesign as per Allan's Sketch-D2-27/03/23

Signatures:
Client:
Client:
Builder:

Landscaping DA06

Ref No. N/A.
Job No. 5109
Dwn No. 2.02



80

This Drawing is to be read in conjunction with all relevant Drawings related to the Project for accurate co-ordination of services. The Contractor is to check all dimensions on site before the commencement of work. Should any discrepancies occur, notify the Builder immediately. These Drawings remain the property of the Builder and shall be returned upon request.



LHS - new build under development



#80

Note: extent of landscaping not shown in rendered elevation image. Refer to landscaping plans.




#78

N/A

Street Scapes DA05

5109

4.03



A: Suite 44 Cottesloe Central Shopping Centre, 460 Stirling Highway, Peppermint Grove, WA 6011
T: 08 9234 4866 F: 08 9234 6344 E: reception@riverstone.com.au
W: www.riverstone.com.au
© Copyright. This drawing and design is copyright and may not be reproduced or copied in whole or in part without the express written permission of Riverstone Custom Homes.

Barbas Residence
Lot 102 #80 Auckland Street,
North Perth, WA 6006

Wind Classification T.B.C.
Amendment: DA05 Large Attach Increased SMC-23/03/23
DA05 W05 changed to Minor opening SMC-22-05-03
DA05 - FF Bath room layout changed as per Council's requirements - 02-30/06/23
DA05 - Redesign as per Alan's Sketch-02-27/03/23
City of Vincent
Client: Daniel Zhao
Date: 26/05/2023 at 12:51 PM

Signature: _____
Client: _____
Date: _____
Builder: _____

Summary of Submissions:

The table below summarise the comments received during the first advertising period (25 January 2023 to 8 February 2023) of the proposal, together with Administration's response to each comment.

Comments Received in Objection:	Administration Comment:
<p><u>General</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed development is excessively proportioned and not appropriately scaled for the site context. As a result, significant street setback concessions are being sought across both levels of the development. The proposed development does not compliment the houses of the adjoining and surrounding neighbourhood which consist of mainly single storey, largely set back dwellings. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposal development has been amended and designed to respond to the setbacks of the approved two storey dwelling that is currently under construction to the northern adjoining property and the existing single storey dwelling to the south. The proposed development has also been designed to step the building height from two storeys on the northern side to single storey adjacent to the southern property. The building has been designed to incorporate articulation with varying setbacks, glazing, roof form, eaves, design detailing and colours and materials that assist in reducing the impacts of building bulk and scale. The application is not seeking discretion in relation to building height and the site and surrounding properties are located within a two storey height limit area under the Built Form Policy. There are existing two storey houses along Auckland Street consistent with this.
<p><u>Streetscape & Primary Setback</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerns relating to the significant ground floor street setback variation and no upper floor street setback as it wouldn't complement or be consistent with any approved or existing dwellings on Auckland Street. Concerns relating to the ground floor setback variation being far too excessive. Additionally, given the lack of upper floor setback, the proposed dwelling would make the area feel overwhelming. The proposed 2.5 metre primary street setback results in a poor outcome for adjoining properties in relation to the bulk and scale of the building and privacy. The building's incorporation of design features and minor projections, emphasise the bulk and scale of the development to the street, exacerbating the impact of the reduced street setbacks on the streetscape character. The reduced street setbacks disconnect the subject site from the remainder of Auckland Street and unnecessarily obstructs access to views of significance. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed development has been amended to increase the street setback and provide articulation and separation between ground and upper floors. The proposal development has been amended and designed to respond to the setbacks of the approved two storey dwelling that is currently under construction to the northern adjoining property and the existing single storey dwelling to the south. The proposed development meets the deemed-to-comply standards of the R Codes relating to visual privacy. The building design response assists in reducing the impact of building bulk that is commonly associated with blank, solid walls presented to the street. Access to views of significance is a design principle assessment under the R Codes relevant to application's seeking discretion in respect to building height. The application meets the building height deemed-to-comply standard of two storeys and no discretion is being sought in respect to building height. This means that views of significance is not relevant to the discretion being sought and in the consideration of this application.

Summary of Submissions:

Comments Received in Objection:	Administration Comment:
<p><u>Upper Floor Street Setback</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The upper floors would not be distinguished from the lower storeys resulting in an upper floor which would have considerable visual bulk to the streetscape. The proposed upper floor would dominate the dwelling façade and create an imposing streetscape presence which would considerably undermine the established and consistent streetscape character. 	<p>The proposed plans have been amended to provide articulation between ground and upper floors. This would delineate between the two levels and assist in reducing the visual bulk impact on the street and present as being less visually dominant as viewed from the street.</p>
<p><u>Lot Boundary Setback</u></p> <p>Concerns relating to the proposed bulk of the eastern elevation and its impact on the adjoining property.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed plans have been amended to provide obscured windows to the kitchen and results in the eastern lot boundary setback meeting the deemed-to-comply standard under the R Codes. The eastern elevation of the dwelling has amended to be treated with contrasting coloured render to the upper floor and moulding strips to differentiate between the ground and upper floors.
<p><u>Landscaping</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The compromised street setback would restrict the development's ability to provide a suitable level of landscaping to contribute to the streetscape and offset impacts of bulk and scale. Concerns relating to the lack of a garden, vegetation and a shade tree as it would result in a considerable loss to existing green streetscape along the entire length of Auckland Street. Concerns relate to the proposal's minimal landscaping visible from the street with a disproportionately large area of impervious surfaces. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The landscaping plan submitted provides for 36.8 percent canopy coverage at maturity and 19.2 percent deep soil and planting areas. This exceeds the Built Form Policy deemed-to-comply standards, noting that these standards have not been approved by the Western Australian Planning Commission and are given regard only in the consideration of the application. 15 trees and other plantings are proposed to be planted within deep soil and planting areas located to the front setback area and to lot boundaries. This would assist in reducing the impact of the development on the adjoining residential properties and to the street, and would make an effective contribution to the landscaping outcome and canopy coverage on site. The 10 trees are proposed to be planted within the front setback area. Tree planting to the front setback area would assist in softening the view of the development as viewed from Auckland Street. There are also three existing street trees in the Auckland Street verge adjacent to the property and which would be retained.

Summary of Submissions:

Comments Received in Objection:	Administration Comment:
<p><u>Design and Character</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> As Auckland Street is a leafy street with modest new dwellings and original character homes, all substantially setback from the street, the proposed dwelling does not complement the existing character and charm of the street. Concerns relate to the proposed development not complementing or being sympathetic to the general character of Auckland Street as the street consists of wide, open front lawns/gardens and single storey houses with substantial setbacks and minimal privacy issues. Concerns regarding the inconsistency with the local and neighbourhood character, with specific reference to the proposed bulk and scale of the proposed development. Concerns that the bulk and scale of the proposed development will negatively impact on the amenity and character of the surrounding area. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed development references and incorporates traditional building elements present in the street. Given the irregular lot shape created through subdivision of the parent lot, the site does not have adequate depth to enable larger setbacks to older homes along Auckland Street. Properties located to the south of the subject site on the same eastern side of Auckland Street are capable of subdivision given their lot size. This means that they are capable of redevelopment and infill in the future, and this would likely have an influence on the established street setbacks. Refer to Administration's responses to 'General' and 'Streetscape & Primary Setback' in relation to building height, bulk and scale.
<p><u>Visual Privacy</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerns relating to the visual privacy to the north (from the minor projection) and south (from the balcony) that will be an issue for adjoining neighbours children who play in the front garden. The result of the backfill to the alfresco area (south) would detrimentally affect the southern adjoining property. The proposal has not been designed or landscaped with any regard for privacy of the adjoining neighbours. Concerns relating to the visual privacy to the south (from the alfresco). 	<p>The proposed dwelling meets the deemed-to-comply standards of the R Codes in relation to visual privacy and this is not a discretionary consideration for this application.</p>
<p><u>Other</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerns relating to the proposed change in level along the southern boundary as the current plans show no indication of erecting sufficient fencing. Concerns regarding the future structural integrity and waterproofing of the existing southern boundary wall. Concerns relating to the ground works potentially impacting the structural integrity of the southern adjoining lots as the dwelling is an original 1930's Californian bungalow with brick and tile on limestone. Possible vibration during building works may damage the integral character features of the property. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dividing fences are a matter under the <i>Dividing Fences Act 1961</i> and are to be installed in accordance with the specifications of the City's <i>Fencing Local Law 2008</i>. It does not form part of this application. Structural integrity and works that may affect adjoining land are matters dealt with under the <i>Building Act 2012</i>, and is not a consideration dealt with at the development application stage. It is the responsibility of the builder for the effective management of construction works and to ensure that this is undertaken in the interest of nearby residents and properties. The City's Policy No. 7.5.23 Construction Management Plans does not require the builder to prepare dilapidation reports in this circumstance, though this is available to them given their obligations to manage construction works.

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

Summary of Submissions:

The table below summarise the comments received during the first advertising period (25 January 2023 to 8 February 2023) of the proposal, together with Administration's response to each comment.

Comments Received in Objection:	Administration Comment:
<p><u>General</u></p> <p>Concerns relate to the location of the pool in relation to the balcony and the possible situation where people jump into the pool from the balcony.</p>	<p>This is not a relevant planning consideration. The concern is speculative and is not addressed in the planning framework.</p>
<p><u>Impact on Northern Adjoining Property</u></p> <p>Concerns relate to the proposed reduced street setback and bulk significantly impacting views of significance and as such, the property's value.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed development aligns with the street setback pattern established by the adjoining property to the north, which is currently under construction. • Access to views of significance is not a relevant design principle consideration for this application, as the proposal complies with building height deemed-to-comply standards under the R Codes. • The impact of development on property values is not a relevant planning consideration
<p><u>Lot Boundary Setback</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerns relating to the proposed bulk of the eastern elevation being increased, as a greater concession on the eastern boundary setback for Bed 1/Study is being sought. • Proposed outdoor living area is not compliant with R Codes 5.1.3 Lot Boundary Setback, C3.1(iii) which requires unenclosed areas accessible, elevated 0.5m or more above natural ground level, to be setback 1.5m. The proposed Alfresco is setback 1.0m with eaves further extending into the setback area. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed development was amended following the second round of community consultation, providing obscured windows to the kitchen and resulting in the eastern lot boundary setback becoming compliant with the deemed-to-comply standards of the R Codes. This includes the Bed1/Study wall on the upper floor eastern lot boundary setback that complies with the deemed-to-comply standards of the R Codes. • The deemed-to-comply standard of the R Codes does not apply as it has been replaced by the Built Form Policy. The R Codes deemed-to-comply standard for Clause 5.1.3 C3.1(ii) relating to patio setbacks applies and the alfresco complies with this. The outdoor living area has also been designed so that its finished floor levels are stepped in line with natural ground levels and so that it is no greater than 0.5 metres higher.
<p><u>Garage Setback</u></p> <p>Proposed garage has been setback 0.44m from ground floor dwelling alignment which does not align with the street context of Auckland Street (single car garages and carports).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed plans were amended following the second round of consultation, providing the garage with a 0.5 metre setback behind the ground floor dwelling alignment. This meets the deemed-to-comply standard of the Built Form Policy. • Auckland Street is characterised by a mix of on-site parking arrangements including uncovered car parking areas, carports, and single and double garages. In reviewing the surrounding streetscape in the northern half of Auckland Street between Gill Street and Hobart Street, the single house under construction to the northern adjoining property at No. 31 Gill Street has a double garage, as does existing houses at Nos. 61, 63, 67, 69, 74 and 76 Auckland Street.

Summary of Submissions:

Comments Received in Objection:	Administration Comment:
<p><u>Outdoor Living Area</u></p> <p>The proposed outdoor living area is significantly less than the deemed-to-comply 30 square metres, as outdoor living areas within the primary street setback area cannot contribute to the total outdoor living area.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The deemed-to-comply standard of the R Codes sets out that outdoor living areas are to be located behind the street setback area. This does not mean that the area of an outdoor living area located within the street setback area do not contribute towards outdoor living, as it still meets the definition of outdoor living area. Rather, the proposal requires a design principle assessment to be undertaken under the R Codes in respect to the outdoor living area location. The outdoor living area location meets the design principles of the R Codes. It exceeds the deemed-to-comply area of 30 square metres and minimum dimension of 4 metres, and is accessible directly from the kitchen, dining and living room spaces. This means it is able to be used in conjunction with these primary living spaces, and would be of a functional size.
<p><u>Landscaping</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Query whether the canopy coverage (30 percent), deep soil (12 percent) and planting area (3 percent) requirements have been met. Concerns relating to the proposed species of trees selected within the landscaping plan with specific concerns relating to the spacing not being sufficient between trees. Concerns relate to the trees located on the lot boundaries and the maintenance required to ensure neighbouring properties are not impacted by overgrowth and root systems. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The landscaping plan provides for 36.8 percent canopy coverage at maturity and 19.2 percent deep soil and planting areas. This exceeds the Built Form Policy deemed-to-comply standards, noting that these standards have not been approved by the Western Australian Planning Commission and are given regard only in the consideration of the application. A condition of approval is recommended requiring an updated landscaping plan to be submitted and approved by the City that provides for adequate spacing between trees to be planted. The City's policy framework does not include specific requirements that restrict trees from being planted adjacent to lot boundaries. A landowner is entitled to trim/remove trees and roots up to the property boundary.
<p><u>Community Consultation</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerns that only the adjoining properties have been consulted on all current and historic planning applications with regards to both No. 80 Auckland Street and No. 31 Gill Street. Concerns that the extent of advertising is not sufficient as variations (such as those relating to street setback) impact more than just the adjoining properties. 	<p>Community consultation on development applications is undertaken in accordance with the City's Community and Stakeholder Engagement Policy that prescribes the extent of properties for owners and occupiers to receive written notification. These applications are also published on the City's Imagine Vincent website to ensure widespread notification and to enable all interested community members to make a submission on the application, consistent with the Policy standards.</p>

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

Summary of Submissions:

The table below summarise the comments received during the initial advertising period (25 January 2023 to 8 February 2023) of the proposal.

Comments Received in Objection:	Applicant's Comment
<p><u>General</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed development is excessively proportioned and not appropriately scaled for the site context. As a result significant street setback concessions are being sought across both levels of the development. Concerns relate to the proposed development not complimenting the houses of the adjoining and surrounding neighbourhood which consist of mainly single storey, largely setback, dwellings. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The block has a very wide frontage and is significantly shorter on one side, creating an awkward wedge shape. The total lot area is relatively small at 353sqm, making it undevelopable with compliant setbacks. The size and shape of the block mean it would be very difficult to build a single storey dwelling. We have amended the plans to have the upper floor setback from the ground floor, to address comments from the City and neighbours.
<p><u>Streetscape & Primary Setback</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerns relating to the significant ground floor street setback variation and no upper floor street setback as it wouldn't complement or be consistent with any approved or existing dwellings on Auckland Street. The buildings incorporation of design features and minor projections, emphasise the bulk and scale of the development to the street, exacerbating the impact of the reduced street setbacks on the streetscape character. The reduced street setbacks disconnect the subject site from the remainder of Auckland Street and unnecessarily obstructs access to views of significance. Concerns relating to the ground floor setback variation being far too excessive. Additionally, given the lack of upper floor setback, the proposed dwelling would make the area feel overwhelming. The proposed 2.9m primary street setback results in a poor outcome for adjoining properties in relation to the bulk and scale of the building and privacy. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The size, shape and orientation of the block, as well as the sewer easement at the rear, make it extremely difficult to develop without some variations to setbacks. We have amended the plans to address the upper floor – this is now setback from the ground floor as per the City's comments. The projections have been removed from the design, to reduce the bulk and scale as per the City's comments. We are fully compliant on building heights and roof pitch, therefore comments around views of significance are not relevant. Upper floor setback has been addressed in the amended plans.

Comments Received in Objection:	Applicant's Comment
<p><u>Upper Floor Street Setback</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The upper floors would not be distinguished from the lower storeys resulting in an upper floor which would have considerable visual bulk to the streetscape. The proposed upper floor would dominate the dwelling façade and create an imposing streetscape presence which would considerably undermine the established and consistent streetscape character. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The upper floor setback has been addressed in the amended plans, as per the City's comments.
<p><u>Lot Boundary Setback</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerns relating to the proposed bulk of the eastern elevation and its impact on the adjoining property. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The eastern elevation has been adjusted in the amended plans, we have added articulation to the wall, added highlight windows to break it up, and incorporated landscaping.
<p><u>Landscaping</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The compromised street setback would restrict the development's ability to provide a suitable level of landscaping to contribute to the streetscape and offset impacts of bulk and scale. Concerns relating to the lack of a garden, vegetation and a shade tree as it would result in a considerable loss to existing green streetscape along the entire length of Auckland Street. Concerns relate to the proposals minimal landscaping visible from the street with a disproportionately large area of impervious surfaces. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Landscaping areas have been adjusted and are shown in the amended plans.
<p><u>Design and Character</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> As Auckland Street is a leafy street with modest new dwellings and original character homes, all substantially setback from the street, the proposed dwelling does not complement the existing character and charm of the street. Concerns relate to the proposed development not complementing or being sympathetic to the general character of Auckland Street as the street consists of wide, open front lawns/gardens and single storey houses with substantial setbacks and minimal privacy issues. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The required 7.7m setback is not possible on this site, as discussed in our extensive research and development of the plans with the City of Vincent, likewise a functional single storey house is very difficult to achieve on a 353sqm block Significant effort has been made to design a traditional style home to complement the existing character of the street. Comments stating otherwise are misinformed, are opinion, and are not relevant. As the applicant we have committed significant time and research into this development, dating back to July 2022 when we first met with the City to discuss the design, prior to submitting a DA. From the start of the process we have been

Comments Received in Objection:	Applicant's Comment
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerns regarding the inconsistency with the local and neighbourhood character, with specific reference to the proposed bulk and scale of the proposed development. Concerns that the bulk and scale of the proposed development will negatively impact on the amenity and character of the surrounding area. 	<p>working closely with the City, trying to design something in line with the City's policies around design and character, on what we all agree is a difficult site.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The design is a very attractive, relatively small house at 319sqm, and will positively impact on the amenity and character of the surrounding area.
<p><u>Visual Privacy</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerns relating to the visual privacy to the north (from the minor projection) and south (from the balcony) that will be an issue for adjoining neighbours children who play in the front garden. The result of the backfill to the alfresco area (south) would detrimentally affect the southern adjoining property. The proposal has not been designed or landscaped with any regard for privacy of the adjoining neighbours. Concerns relating to the visual privacy to the south (from the alfresco). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are no variations sought on visual privacy or fill, so these comments are not relevant.
<p><u>Other</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerns relating to the proposed change in level along the southern boundary as the current plans show no indication of erecting sufficient fencing. Concerns regarding the future structural integrity and waterproofing of the existing southern boundary wall. Concerns relating to the ground works potentially impacting the structural integrity of the southern adjoining lots as the dwelling is an original 1930's Californian bungalow with brick and tile on limestone. Possible vibration during building works may damage the integral character features of the property. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The construction of the home will occur within all the relevant building codes and requirements

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

Further to the concerns raised within the previous consultation period, the table below summarise the additional comments received during the secondary advertising period (4 May 2023 to 10 May 2023) of the proposal.

Comments Received in Objection:	Applicant's Comment
<p><u>General</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerns relate to the location of the pool with relation to the balcony and the possible situation where people jump into the pool from the balcony. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The pool is fully compliant. The owners are mature adults with no plans to jump off the balcony.
<p><u>Impact on Northern Adjoining Property</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerns relate to the proposed reduced street setback and bulk significantly impacting views of significance and, as such the property's value. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Our design is fully compliant on wall heights and roof pitch, and meets design principles guidelines in all areas including street setback. We also made significant changes to the plans after the first assessment in response to these concerns. Any house built on our block would impact the Northern neighbour's views – this is not the owner's fault, they should be allowed to develop their own land. The northern neighbour cannot reasonably expect our owners to build a single storey on such a small block, or for the site to remain undeveloped, just to maintain their own view. The northern neighbour is also building a two-storey home, it is unreasonable to attempt to block others doing the same.
<p><u>Lot Boundary Setback</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerns relating to the proposed bulk of the eastern elevation being increased as a greater concession on the Eastern boundary setback for Bed 1/Study is being sought. Proposed outdoor living area is not compliant with R-Codes 5.1.3 Lot Boundary Setback, C3.1(iii) which requires unenclosed areas accessible, elevated 0.5m or more above natural ground level, to be setback 1.5m. The proposed Alfresco is setback 1.0m with eaves further extending into the setback area. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We have provided amended plans to address the eastern elevation setback, and this is no longer a variation.
<p><u>Garage Setback</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed garage has been setback 0.44m from ground floor dwelling alignment which does not align with the street context of Auckland Street (single car garages and carports). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The garage setback has been amended to address this concern and this is no longer a variation. Amended plans have been provided.

Comments Received in Objection:	Applicant's Comment
<p><u>Outdoor Living Area</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed outdoor living area is significantly less than the deemed to comply 30m² as outdoor living areas, within the primary street setback area, cannot contribute to the total outdoor living area. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Our proposal meets the design principles guidelines for outdoor living areas.
<p><u>Landscaping</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Queries regarding whether the canopy coverage (30%), deep soil (12%) and planting area (3%) requirements have been met. Concerns relating to the proposed species of trees selected within the landscaping plan with specific concerns relating to the spacing not being sufficient between trees. Concerns relate to the trees located on the lot boundaries and the maintenance required to ensure neighbouring properties are not impacted (by overgrowth and root systems). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Landscaping plans have been provided, then amended and provided again, based on comments from the DRP and community, and are in line with the City's local policies, including species and spacing.
<p><u>Other – Community Consultation</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerns that only the adjoining properties have been consulted on all current and historic planning applications with regards to both 80 Auckland Street and 31 Gill Street. Concerns that the extent of advertising is not sufficient as variations (such as those relating to street setback) impact more than just the adjoining properties. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is hard to see the logic behind this comment. The DA process for this site, including the advertising, has been long, extensive, thorough, extremely onerous on the applicant and at times frustrating. The current applicants and owners have made significant concessions and changes to the plans, we have addressed every single concern raised by the community and the city. We have provided amended plans several times, pages and pages of supporting information, and been through two rounds of community consultation and DRP review. We have been engaged in several meetings with the planning department, we have made amendments to the plans quickly and efficiently, we have provided all the required information in a timely matter. The City has had the application for 180 days. The consultation period has been more than sufficient. This comment provides evidence that the neighbour is trying to block any development on our site, in any way possible.

Design Review Panel – Applicant Response:

DRP Chairperson Referral 1 - Development Plans as Originally Submitted

The development plans dated 25 November 2022 were referred to the Design Review Panel (DRP) Chairperson. The DRP Chairperson provided the following comments in respect to the plans.

The DRP Chairperson noted the following positive aspects of the proposal:

- It is acknowledged the proposal is situated on a challenging irregular shaped, thin, sloping site with a small 7.3 metres wide south side boundary (when you remove the sewer easement).
- More than 50 percent of the front streetscape doesn't have a fence, the portion that does has a visually permeable front fence and there are a large number of windows on the front facade generating an active streetscape and high level of passive surveillance.
- Both verge trees will be retained.
- The ground level footprint utilises multiple floor levels which responds to the natural ground level/slope on the site.

The DRP Chairperson noted the following areas for improvement:

- The drawings don't show the surrounding context illustrating how the proposal sits in and responds to its context. Given the significant front setback variation being sought an analysis of the front setbacks to other properties in the street would also be useful.
- The main living areas, alfresco space and master bedroom are all orientated to the south or west providing limited north light access and exposing these rooms to the harsh western setting sun.
- There are a number of west facing windows without passive shading devices.
- Consider placing the garage on the southern side of the site which would generate opportunities to locate the main living areas, alfresco and master bedroom on the north (wider) section of the site allowing more northern sunlight access. Due to the angle of the site this would also mean the garage would be located behind the front elevation of the house rather than the current highly prominent position in-front of the house façade. This would potentially require an even smaller front setback on the south side of the front boundary but would potentially allow a number of other positive outcomes.
- The architectural language looks to replicate character houses in the local area but currently presents as a faux or 'moch' interpretation / style.
- The proposal generates a large 4 Bed + Family Room house on a relatively small block but includes minimal areas of soft landscaping and no new trees on the site offering limited resident amenity or contribution to its surrounding context.
- The paving on the east side and the decking in the south west corner appear excessive given there is minimal soft landscaping proposed on the site. These could both be reduced to increase soft landscaping on the site.
- The open area in the centre of the front setback (on the west side of the Living Room) is an opportunity for a decent size new tree.
- No soft landscaping details or planting species have been included with the application.
- The proposal does not nominate any external colours for the face brick, rendered walls, window frames, roof sheeting, gutters, barge boards, down pipes etc. Recommend the applicant provides further information in relation to materials and colours for review.
- The east elevation presents as a flat, monotonous two storey wall, with no articulation or diversity of materiality/colour. The applicant is encouraged to increase the level of articulation and diversity of materiality on this facade to improve this interface with the adjoining property and surrounding context.
- The current design does not clearly distinguish the upper floor from the and lower floor as both floor footprints are very similar presenting a relatively flat façade.

Design Review Panel – Applicant Response:

DRP Chairperson Referral 2 - Revised Development Plans (dated 29 March 2023)

In response to the DRP Chairperson comments, the applicant made a suite of changes to the proposal through amended plans dated 29 March 2023. A summary of the changes is as follows:

- The setback of the ground floor from the primary street boundary increased from 2.5 metres to the garage to 2.9 metres to the dining room.
- The setback of the porch from the primary street boundary decreased from 3.0 metres to 2.2 metres.
- The setback of the upper floor from the ground floor building line increased from nil to the garage to 0.7 metres to the sitting room.
- The setback of the upper floor balcony from the ground floor building line increased from 0.2 metres to 0.6 metres.
- The length of the northern boundary wall reduced from 7.9 metres to 7.6 metres.
- The setback of the garage from the ground floor building line increased from nil to 0.5 metres.
- The setback from the northern boundary of the ground floor bed/study wall decreased from 2.1 metres to 1.2 metres.
- The eastern façade modified to increase articulation, introducing the stepping forward of a portion (bathroom, bed 4 and water closet) of the dwelling.
- The primary street fence piers reduced from 0.5 metres in width to 0.3 metres.
- A landscaping plan prepared, providing for 19.2 percent deep soil areas and 30.1 percent of the site as canopy coverage at maturity.

The amended plans dated 29 March 2023 were referred to the DRP Chairperson, with their following comments provided against the 10 principles of good design and subsequent response from the applicant:

DRP Chairperson Comment	Applicant’s Response
<p><u>Context & Character</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The front setback variation and positioning of the double garage in-front of the main façade of the house is not reflective of the surrounding built form context and character as well as the City’s Built Form Policy. Consider a carport. • The surrounding buildings have not been shown on the floorplans or elevations and no visual analysis of the surrounding context has been undertaken to illustrate how the proposal sits within or impacts on the surrounding properties / context. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is not a good solution in terms of safety, security, functionality and quality of life for the owners. Garages are not an extravagant luxury, they are a modern convenience, and a more cost effective option than adding electric gates and increased fencing to provide security. The only reason to implement is for the look of the façade in relation to the City’s local policy. • Elevation image including the house next door is attached. Our design looks very similar to the house next door, and therefore sits well within the streetscape. We do not have access to images of the house on the other side, which is about to be built. Our design is not the only house in the street with proposed variations – we note No. 67 Auckland Street, which is a relatively new build, not character in style, and has no differentiation between the upper and ground floors (our design now has significant differentiation). No. 67 Auckland Street is also a new build, with the garage set forward of the rest of the building line, and the upper floor overhanging the garage. Our design is doing much more than these new builds to address the context of the area and will sit well within the surrounding properties.

Design Review Panel – Applicant Response:

DRP Chairperson Comment	Applicant's Response
<p><u>Landscape Quality</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Little information has been provided in relation to the soft landscaping / planting. Encourage the applicant to include plant spacings, pot / tree sizes, details in relation to reticulation and utilising water-wise native species • The Frangipani is located in a position with a first floor roof overhangs over which will limit its growth. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Plant and tree species have been identified on the plan. These are from the City's recommended list. We can add a note about the gardens being reticulated, however a detailed plan by a landscape designer is expensive and will take months to produce. • Please refer to the included landscaping plan – all the requested information has been provided on this plan. We have increased the spacing and added reticulation notes, we have included water-wise species from the City's recommended list. The landscaping has come a long way from the original proposal and we have responded to all the City's comments around landscaping. We request the DRP to change their report to green on this element, as we have implemented everything they have asked here.
<p><u>Built Form & Scale</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The garage and upper level setback from the front façade has increased however the previously non-compliant setback to the rear has further decreased to achieve this. • Given the size as well as shape of the site and the rear easement achieving a large 4 bedroom house, plus family room and double garage is difficult. The built form on the site appears over-developed resulting in an outcome which is out of keeping with the surrounding context and has negative amenity impacts for both residents and adjoining neighbours. • The double garage sits a significant distance in-front of the front façade of the house. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • These items comply with the planning framework. We note the examples of No. 67 and No. 61, as well as No. 69, where the garage is also sitting in front of the front façade of the house.
<p><u>Functionality and Build Quality</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No comments 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No comments
<p><u>Sustainability</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All living spaces are orientated south or west and the house generally obtains minimal north light access. • Encourage the applicant to integrate ESD initiatives such as solar panels, not using gas and EV charging capability. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Solar panels / EV are intended following the build (these are not being done by us as the builder and therefore for clarity, these are not included on our plans). We note that the roof overhangs have been added following the City's

Design Review Panel – Applicant Response:

DRP Chairperson Comment	Applicant's Response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The roof overhangs will provide limited shading to the significant number of large west facing windows to all living spaces. 	<p>recommendation. The landscaping provided will also assist with shading to these windows.</p>
<p><u>Amenity</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> All living spaces are orientated south or west and the house generally obtains minimal north light access. Bed 4 has a 2.8 metre dimension which should be increased to a minimum dimension of 3 metres. Bed 4 is reliant on a high level window which limits its outlook, natural light access and cross ventilation. Show the bins and AC external units in a position that does not impact on the amenity of residents or neighbours. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Please see amended plans. Bed 4 has increased to 2.95 metres. Bins now shown on the plan, placement of AC external units is still TBC by AC provider, however they will be placed as per requirements and not impact on neighbours. We have already addressed the placement of the living spaces in our justification. We note bed 4 is a minor bedroom and a place to sleep, and therefore the lack of a north facing window should be tolerated.
<p><u>Legibility</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No comments 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No comments
<p><u>Safety</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No comments 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No comments
<p><u>Community</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No comments 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No comments
<p><u>Aesthetics</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The rear (east) elevation is still entirely reliant on rendered materiality with large blank areas. Recommend incorporating a diversity of textural materiality on this façade such as some face brick. Additional face brick has been added to the front (west) façade which is supported however this has been introduced at upper level with rendered walls at lower level. Suggest flipping this or 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Please see amended plans – we have redesigned the upper floor bathroom and WC and provided more articulation in the rear wall. Please also refer to the landscaping plan for the extent of landscaping to this side of the house, which is significant and will soften the appearance of this wall. Introducing a different material to this wall has significant cost and construction implications, which needs to be considered and balanced against this request. The rear wall is not visible from the street, or the sides – it is a rear wall that is only visible from one neighbour's backyard.

Design Review Panel – Applicant Response:

DRP Chairperson Comment	Applicant's Response
<p>adding greater face brick at lower level as well which more closely reflects the use of face brick at ground level on traditional character houses.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The proposal does not nominate any external colours for the face brick, rendered walls, window frames, roof sheeting, gutters, barge boards, down pipes etc. Recommend the applicant providing further information in relation to the proposed materials and colours.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The face brick is an attractive feature and has been used to distinguish the upper and lower levels as requested. Our design is a modern representation of classic design, we aren't trying to appear faux character or replicate an old house. To increase the amount of face brick that is already proposed, will significantly increase the cost of the build, which needs to be considered.• Please see amended plans. Aesthetically this is a very attractive house and we believe this element should change to green also.

Design Review Panel – Applicant Response:

DRP Chairperson Referral 3 - Revised Development Plans (dated 24 April 2023)

In response to the DRP Chairperson comments, the applicant made further amendments in plans dated 24 April 2023. These amended plans were provided accompanying the applicant’s response in the table above to the DRP Chairperson’s comments. A summary of the changes is as follows:

- Amendments to the landscaping plan including:
 - increased spacing of planting;
 - updates to species list to include water-wise species from the City’s recommended list;
 - provision of additional plantings (bamboo) along the eastern lot boundary; and
 - increase in canopy coverage to 36.8 percent of the subject site at maturity.
- Increase in dimension of bed 4 minimum dimension from 2.8 metres to 2.95 metres.
- Reduction of upper floor bathroom area, providing articulation in the walls presenting to the north and east.
- Increased primary street setback to the entry porch from 2.2 metres to 2.7 metres.

The amended plans dated 24 April 2023 were referred to the DRP Chairperson, with a summary of their comments provided against the 10 principles of good design and subsequent response from the applicant:

Design Review Panel Comment	Applicant’s Comment
<p><u>Context & Character</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The front setback and positioning of the double garage in front of the main façade of the house is not reflective of the surrounding area. • Further information is needed in relation to the surrounding context. • Given the irregular shaped site, it is difficult to develop a character style of house. Most character house styles have a lot which is deeper than it is wide and provide a larger upper level setback. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Surrounding context information has been provided in previous comments and in streetscape elevation image with photos of adjoining sites. • It is more opinion than fact to say the style is unfortunate in relation to the site. We believe the design is very attractive and responds well to the site and to the planning framework.
<p><u>Landscape Quality</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preference generally for a landscaping plan to be prepared by a landscape architect or professional to ensure a viable landscaping outcome is achieved. • Details of plant spacings, pot / tree sizes, reticulation and species to be included in landscaping plan. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The landscape plan has been done by the applicant, in conjunction with the City’s landscape policies and recommendations. • The owners are likely to engage a landscape designer down the track, and do plan to achieve a high level of landscaping with the finished house. We can provide updated landscaping plans when this happens. • The time taken in council for the DA process is having significant financial impact on the owners, with holding costs of the undeveloped land, finance costs, and

Design Review Panel – Applicant Response:

Design Review Panel Comment	Applicant's Comment
	<p>rental costs. Engaging a landscape designer is an expensive exercise, particularly when it's uncertain if / when this DA is going to be approved.</p>
<p><u>Built Form & Scale</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Both the primary street and rear setback do not appear consistent with the surrounding context. • The built form appears too large for a shallow and irregular shaped site. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The design responds to the planning framework and meets the design principles guidelines.
<p><u>Functionality and Build Quality</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No comments. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No comments.
<p><u>Sustainability</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environmentally sustainable design initiatives to be integrated. • Living spaces and the main bedroom are orientated south or west, with minimal northern light access. • Shading to western facing windows. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The orientation was chosen to achieve the best possible outcomes around the planning framework (particularly the setbacks) and design guidelines. • An overshadowing variation for the northern neighbouring lot was approved, and therefore the northern side of our site will be in perpetual shade anyway. • The site has 26 metre western frontage. It's impossible not to have west facing windows on a site such as this. Eaves and landscaping have been provided to improve shading.
<p><u>Amenity</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bedroom 4 should have a minimum 3 metre dimension. • Bedroom 4 is reliant on high level window for amenity. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Our original application had no bedrooms under a 3 metre dimension. Throughout this long process, lots of amendments have been made to the plans in response to feedback from the City and community consultation, and this was one of the changes made, in order to improve the boundary setbacks. The design meets the planning framework.
<p><u>Legibility</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No comments. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No comments.

Design Review Panel – Applicant Response:

Design Review Panel Comment	Applicant's Comment
<p><u>Safety</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">No comments.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">No comments.
<p><u>Community</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">No comments.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">No comments.
<p><u>Aesthetics</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">The rear elevation is lacking diversity of textural materiality.Incorporating face brick at ground level better reflects traditional style housing.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Throughout the process, we have made significant amendments to the plans and attempts to address this concern, including redesigning this side of the house to lessen the bulk and add more articulation to the walls, adding / changing windows, and adding significant landscaping to soften it.We note the natural constraints of the site, the cost and construction implications of adding an expensive face brick to what is essentially the 'dead' side of the house, and that this side of the house is not visible from the street or to any neighbours, it is only visible from the backyard of one house.

Final Development Plans (dated 2 June 2023)

Final amendments were made to the proposed plans on 2 June 2023 in response to the DRP comments.


These amendments included the following changes:

- Providing obscured glass to the kitchen window to the eastern façade. The proposal satisfies the deemed-to-comply standard for eastern lot boundary setback with this change.
- The rear elevation has been treated with contrasting coloured render to the upper floor and moulding strips to differentiate between the ground and upper floors.

This Drawing is to be read in conjunction with all relevant Drawings related to the Project for accurate co-ordination of services. The Contractor is to check all dimensions on site before the commencement of work. Should any discrepancies occur, notify the Builder immediately. These Drawings remain the property of the Builder and shall be returned upon request.

**CITY OF VINCENT
RECEIVED
25 November 2022**

Area Calculations		
Name	Area	Perimeter
0 Ground Floor		
Alfresco	19.2	18,292.0
Garage	43.2	28,960.0
Ground Floor	112.4	54,429.8
	174.8 m²	101,681.8 mm
1 First Floor		
Balcony	6.3	10,580.0
First Floor	138.4	61,749.8
	144.7 m²	72,329.8 mm
	319.5 m²	174,011.6 mm



Stormwater Calculations.
Design criteria:
1. Slope adjustment Factor = 1.3
2. 95x45 Downpipes = 47.5m² of Roof Area.
3. 75dia Downpipes = 49m² of Roof Area.
4. 100dia Downpipes = 87m² of Roof Area.

DRAINAGE NOTES:
1. Volumes are in cubic metres & Areas in square meters.
2. Volume to be stored based on 1m³ for every 80m² of impervious surface.
3. Down pipes to be located so each tank fills at same rate (i.e., Roof Area to each tank is proportional to its Volume).
4. Plumber to confirm Run Layout & location of soak wells.
Drawings are indicative only.

DRAINAGE CALCULATIONS.
Impervious Area (Roof)
Stormwater Area 'A': (Front of home) = 292.168m².
Volume to Store = 3.652m³.
DIAM DEPTH No of TANKS VOLUME
1200 1200 3 4.08m³.
Stormwater Area (Driveway) = 22.255m².
Volume to Store = 0.29m³.
DIAM DEPTH No of TANKS VOLUME
1200 1200 1 1.36m³.
Impervious Area (Paving)
Run to Garden Beds.

TANK VOLUME.

DIAM	DEPTH	VOLUME
1500	900	1.59
	1200	2.12
	1500	2.65
	1800	3.18
1200	900	1.02
	1200	1.36
	1500	1.70
900	900	0.57
	1200	0.76

Site Soil Classification.
1. Soil classification is made by surface visual inspection only.


LOT ZONING R20
LOT AREA 353.00m²
HOUSE AREA 156.93m²
OPEN SPACE 55.54%
OPEN SPACE REQUIRED AS PER R-CODES IS 50%

NEIGHBOUR'S LOT AREA 862.00m²
SHADOW CAST ONTO LOT 39.01m²
AREA OVERSHADOWED 4.53%
OVERSHADOWING PERMITTED AS PER R-CODES IS 25%

Termite Protection.
All primary building elements used for the construction of this building will be consist entirely of, or a combination of, materials considered not subject to termite attack. Specifically, all timbers used in this dwelling will be preservative treated in accordance with AS 3660.1 and will comply with Part 3.1.4.2 of the NCC - Volume 2, 2019.

Site Plan Scale: 1:100

SUPERSEDED



A: Suite 44 Cottesloe Central Shopping Centre, 460 Stirling Highway, Peppermint Grove, WA 6011
T: 08 9284 4866 F: 08 9284 6144 E: reception@riverstone.com.au
W: www.riverstone.com.au
© Copyright. This drawing and design is copyright and may not be reproduced or copied in whole or in part without the express written permission of Riverstone Custom Homes.

Barbas Residence
Lot 102 #80 Auckland Street,
North Perth, WA 6006

Wind Classification T.B.C. Amendments:
Local Authority City of Vincent
Dwn: Daniel Zhao
Plot Date: 24/11/2022 at 5:15 PM

Signatures:
Client: _____
Client: _____
Builder: _____

Site Plan - New DA01
5109
2.02


Ren No. N/A.
Job No. 5109
Rev No. 2.02

This Drawing is to be read in conjunction with all relevant Drawings related to the Project for accurate co-ordination of services. The Contractor is to check all dimensions on site before the commencement of work. Should any discrepancies occur, notify the Builder immediately. These Drawings remain the property of the Builder and shall be returned upon request.

Planning application

**CITY OF VINCENT
RECEIVED
25 November 2022**

Area Calculations		
Name	Area	Perimeter
0 Ground Floor		
Alfresco	19.2	18,292.0
Garage	43.2	28,960.0
Ground Floor	112.4	54,429.8
	174.8 m²	101,681.8 mm
1 First Floor		
Balcony	6.3	10,580.0
First Floor	138.4	61,749.8
	144.7 m²	72,329.8 mm
	319.5 m²	174,011.6 mm



Ground Floor Scale: 1:100

LEGEND

- Ⓢ Smoke Alarm - Hard Wired, Interlinked and to AS 3786-2014
- ⊗ Exhaust fan - flumed to external air and not into the roof space.
- ⌘ Wall mounted cold water hose tap
- ⊕ Water supply for fridge
- ⊕ Gas bayonet point

COMPLIANCE NOTES

- Artificial Lighting** | To comply with NCC Vol. 2 Part 3.12.5.5
- Fall Prevention | Bedroom windows** - where floor is 2m more than surface beneath unless opening sash is greater than 1700mm AFL opening must be permanently restricted to 125mm or fitted with a non-removable robust screen.
- All other windows** - where the fall height is 4m or greater must have a transom above 865mm and a sill height less than 150mm - No restriction is required to opening. Refer to NCC V2 Part 3.9.2.6 and 3.9.2.7
- Boundary Walls To Provide Fire Separation** | To comply with NCC Vol.2 Part 3.7.3.2
- Fireplace** | To comply with NCC Vol.2 Part 3.10.7
- Parapet/Boundary Fireproofing** | To comply with NCC Vol.2 Part 3.7.2.4
- Staircase, Balustrade and Handrails** | To comply with NCC Vol. 2 Part 3.9.1 and 3.9.2 (Nom. 280 Going x 172 Riser).
- Stormwater Drainage** | To comply with NCC V2 Part 3.1.3 citing AS 3500.3
- Swimming Pool Barriers** | To comply with AS 1926.1 and 1926.2
- Timber Framing** | To comply with AS 1684
- Termite Protection** | All primary building elements used for the construction of this building will consist entirely of, or a combination of, materials considered not subject to termite attack. Specifically, all timbers used in this dwelling will be preservative treated in accordance with AS 3660.1 and will comply with Part 3.1.4.2 of the Building Code of Australia - Volume 2, 2019 Amendment 1.
- Parapet Walls** | FMC Homeguard as physical Termite barrier as per AS 3660.1 - 2014 and will comply with Part 3.1.4.2 of the Building Code of Australia - Volume 2, 2019 Amendment 1
- Wet areas** | To comply with NCC Vol.2 Part 3.8.1
- Steelwork** | Exposed steel shall have an anti-corrosive treatment in accordance with the NCC 2019

SUPERSEDED

RIVERSTONE

A: Suite 44 Cottesloe Central Shopping Centre, 460 Stirling Highway, Peppermint Grove, WA 6011
T: 08 9284 4866 F: 08 9284 6144 E: reception@riverstone.com.au
W: www.riverstone.com.au
© Copyright. This drawing and design is copyright and may not be reproduced or copied in whole or in part without the express written permission of Riverstone Custom Homes.


Barbas Residence
Lot 102 #80 Auckland Street,
North Perth, WA 6006

Wind Classification T.B.C. Amendments.
Local Authority City of Vincent
Dwn: Daniel Zhao
Plot Date: 24/11/2022 at 5:15 PM

Signatures:
Client: _____
Client: _____
Builder: _____
N/A.
Ground Floor DA01
5109
2.03

CITY OF VINCENT
RECEIVED
25 November 2022

Area Calculations		
Name	Area	Perimeter
0 Ground Floor		
Allfresco	19.2	18,292.0
Garage	43.2	28,960.0
Ground Floor	112.4	54,429.8
	174.8 m²	101,681.8 mm
1 First Floor		
Balcony	6.3	10,580.0
First Floor	138.4	61,749.8
	144.7 m²	72,329.8 mm
	319.5 m²	174,011.6 mm



First Floor Scale: 1:100

LEGEND

- Smoke Alarm - Hard Wired, Interlinked and to AS 3786-2014
- Exhaust fan - flumed to external air and not into the roof space.
- Wall mounted cold water hose tap
- Water supply for fridge
- Gas bayonet point

COMPLIANCE NOTES

- Artificial Lighting** | To comply with NCC Vol. 2 Part 3.12.5.5
- Fall Prevention | Bedroom windows** - where floor is 2m more than surface beneath unless opening sash is greater than 1700mm AFL opening must be permanently restricted to 125mm or fitted with a non-removable robust screen.
- All other windows** - where the fall height is 4m or greater must have a transom above 865mm and a sill height less than 150mm - No restriction is required to opening. Refer to NCC V2 Part 3.9.2.6 and 3.9.2.7
- Boundary Walls To Provide Fire Separation** | To comply with NCC Vol.2 Part 3.7.3.2
- Fireplace** | To comply with NCC Vol.2 Part 3.10.7
- Parapet/Boundary Fireproofing** | To comply with NCC Vol.2 Part 3.7.2.4
- Staircase, Balustrade and Handrails** | To comply with NCC Vol. 2 Part 3.9.1 and 3.9.2 (Nom. 280 Going x 172 Riser).
- Stormwater Drainage** | To comply with NCC V2 Part 3.1.3 citing AS 3500.3
- Swimming Pool Barriers** | To comply with AS 1926.1 and 1926.2
- Timber Framing** | To comply with AS 1684
- Termite Protection** | All primary building elements used for the construction of this building will consist entirely of, or a combination of, materials considered not subject to termite attack. Specifically, all timbers used in this dwelling will be preservative treated in accordance with AS 3660.1 and will comply with Part 3.1.4.2 of the Building Code of Australia - Volume 2, 2019 Amendment 1.
- Parapet Walls** | FMC Homeguard as physical Termite barrier as per AS 3660.1 - 2014 and will comply with Part 3.1.4.2 of the Building Code of Australia - Volume 2, 2019 Amendment 1
- Wet areas** | To comply with NCC Vol.2 Part 3.8.1
- Steelwork** | Exposed steel shall have an anti-corrosive treatment in accordance with the NCC 2019

SUPERSEDED

RIVERSTONE

A: Suite 44 Cottesloe Central Shopping Centre, 460 Stirling Highway, Peppermint Grove, WA 6011
T: 08 9284 4866 F: 08 9284 6144 E: reception@riverstone.com.au
W: www.riverstone.com.au
© Copyright. This drawing and design is copyright and may not be reproduced or copied in whole or in part without the express written permission of Riverstone Custom Homes.



Barbas Residence
Lot 102 #80 Auckland Street,
North Perth, WA 6006

Wind Classification T.B.C. Amendments.
Local Authority City of Vincent
Dwn: Daniel Zhao
Plot Date: 24/11/2022 at 5:15 PM

Signatures:
Client: _____
Client: _____
Builder: _____
Job No: 5109
Rev No: 2.04
Rev: N/A.

First Floor DA01

CITY OF VINCENT
RECEIVED
25 November 2022



Eaves Overhang 1:20

Roof Plan Scale: 1:100

LEGEND

- Ⓢ Smoke Alarm - Hard Wired, Interlinked and to AS 3786-2014
- ⊗ Exhaust fan - flumed to external air and not into the roof space.
- ⌘ Wall mounted cold water hose tap
- ⊕ Water supply for fridge
- ⊕ Gas bayonet point

COMPLIANCE NOTES

- Artificial Lighting** | To comply with NCC Vol. 2 Part 3.12.5.5
- Fall Prevention | Bedroom windows** - where floor is 2m more than surface beneath unless opening sash is greater than 1700mm AFL opening must be permanently restricted to 125mm or fitted with a non-removable robust screen.
- All other windows** - where the fall height is 4m or greater must have a transom above 865mm and a sill height less than 150mm - No restriction is required to opening.
Refer to NCC V2 Part 3.9.2.6 and 3.9.2.7
- Boundary Walls To Provide Fire Separation** | To comply with NCC Vol.2 Part 3.7.3.2
- Fireplace** | To comply with NCC Vol.2 Part 3.10.7
- Parapet/Boundary Fireproofing** | To comply with NCC Vol.2 Part 3.7.2.4
- Staircase, Balustrade and Handrails** | To comply with NCC Vol. 2 Part 3.9.1 and 3.9.2 (Nom. 280 Going x 172 Riser).
- Stormwater Drainage** | To comply with NCC V2 Part 3.1.3 citing AS 3500.3
- Swimming Pool Barriers** | To comply with AS 1926.1 and 1926.2
- Timber Framing** | To comply with AS 1684
- Termite Protection** | All primary building elements used for the construction of this building will consist entirely of, or a combination of, materials considered not subject to termite attack. Specifically, all timbers used in this dwelling will be preservative treated in accordance with AS 3660.1 and will comply with Part 3.1.4.2 of the Building Code of Australia - Volume 2, 2019 Amendment 1.
- Parapet Walls** | FMC Homeguard as physical Termite barrier as per AS 3660.1 - 2014 and will comply with Part 3.1.4.2 of the Building Code of Australia - Volume 2, 2019 Amendment 1
- Wet areas** | To comply with NCC Vol.2 Part 3.8.1
- Steelwork** | Exposed steel shall have an anti-corrosive treatment in accordance with the NCC 2019

SUPERSEDED

RIVERSTONE

A: Suite 44 Cottesloe Central Shopping Centre, 460 Stirling Highway, Peppermint Grove, WA 6011
T: 08 9284 4866 F: 08 9284 6144 E: reception@riverstone.com.au
W: www.riverstone.com.au
© Copyright. This drawing and design is copyright and may not be reproduced or copied in whole or in part without the express written permission of Riverstone Custom Homes.

Barbas Residence
Lot 102 #80 Auckland Street,
North Perth, WA 6006

Wind Classification T.B.C. Amendments:
Local Authority City of Vincent
Dwn: Daniel Zhao
Plot Date: 24/11/2022 at 5:15 PM


Signatures:
Client: _____
Client: _____
Builder: _____

Roof Plan DA01


Rev No. 01 Job No. 5109
Rev No. 01 Job No. 2.05
N/A.

This Drawing is to be read in conjunction with all relevant Drawings related to the Project for accurate co-ordination of services. The Contractor is to check all dimensions on site before the commencement of work. Should any discrepancies occur, notify the Builder immediately. These Drawings remain the property of the Builder and shall be returned upon request.

**CITY OF VINCENT
RECEIVED
25 November 2022**




E/01a West
2.03 Scale: 1:100



E/01b West
2.03 1:100

Note!
Bedroom windows - where floor is 2m more than surface beneath unless opening sash is greater than 1700mm AFL opening must be permanently restricted to 125mm or fitted with a non-removable robust screen.
All other windows - where the fall height is 4m or greater must have a transom above 865mm and a sill height less than 150mm - No restriction is required to opening.
Refer to NCC V2 Part 3.9.2.6.



E/02 South
2.03 Scale: 1:100

SUPERSEDED



A: Suite 44 Cottesloe Central Shopping Centre, 460 Stirling Highway, Peppermint Grove, WA 6011
T: 08 9284 4866 F: 08 9284 6144 E: reception@riverstone.com.au
W: www.riverstone.com.au
© Copyright. This drawing and design is copyright and may not be reproduced or copied in whole or in part without the express written permission of Riverstone Custom Homes.

Barbas Residence
Lot 102 #80 Auckland Street,
North Perth, WA 6006

Wind Classification T.B.C. Amendments:
Local Authority City of Vincent
Dwn: Daniel Zhao
Plot Date: 24/11/2022 at 5:15 PM

Signatures:
Client: _____
Client: _____
Builder: _____


Elevations -

Ren No: N/A.
Job No: DA01
Job No: 5109
Job No: 4.01


This Drawing is to be read in conjunction with all relevant Drawings related to the Project for accurate co-ordination of services. The Contractor is to check all dimensions on site before the commencement of work. Should any discrepancies occur, notify the Builder immediately. These Drawings remain the property of the Builder and shall be returned upon request.

CITY OF VINCENT
RECEIVED
25 November 2022

Note!
Bedroom windows - where floor is 2m more than surface beneath unless opening sash is greater than 1700mm AFL opening must be permanently restricted to 125mm or fitted with a non-removable robust screen.
All other windows - where the fall height is 4m or greater must have a transom above 865mm and a sill height less than 150mm - No restriction is required to opening.
Refer to NCC V2 Part 3.9.2.6.




E/03 East Scale: 1:100
2.03



E/04a North 1:100
2.03

Note!
Bedroom windows - where floor is 2m more than surface beneath unless opening sash is greater than 1700mm AFL opening must be permanently restricted to 125mm or fitted with a non-removable robust screen.
All other windows - where the fall height is 4m or greater must have a transom above 865mm and a sill height less than 150mm - No restriction is required to opening.
Refer to NCC V2 Part 3.9.2.6.



E/04b North Scale: 1:100
2.03

SUPERSEDED

RIVERSTONE

A: Suite 44 Cottesloe Central Shopping Centre, 460 Stirling Highway, Peppermint Grove, WA 6011
T: 08 9284 4866 F: 08 9284 6144 E: reception@riverstone.com.au
W: www.riverstone.com.au
© Copyright. This drawing and design is copyright and may not be reproduced or copied in whole or in part without the express written permission of Riverstone Custom Homes.

Barbas Residence
Lot 102 #80 Auckland Street,
North Perth, WA 6006


Wind Classification T.B.C. Amendments:
Local Authority City of Vincent
Dwn: Daniel Zhao
Plot Date: 24/11/2022 at 5:15 PM

Signatures:
Client:
Client:
Builder:

Elevations - DA01

Rev No. Job No. 5109
Bdl. Revisg N/A.
4.02


CITY OF VINCENT
RECEIVED
25 November 2022



S/01
2.03

Section

1:100



S/02
2.03

Section

1:100

SUPERSEDED

RIVERSTONE

A: Suite 44 Cottesloe Central Shopping Centre, 460 Stirling Highway,
Peppermint Grove, WA 6011
T: 08 9284 4866 F: 08 9284 6144 E: reception@riverstone.com.au
W: www.riverstone.com.au
© Copyright. This drawing and design is copyright and may not be
reproduced or copied in whole or in part without the express written
permission of Riverstone Custom Homes.

Barbas Residence
Lot 102 #80 Auckland Street,
North Perth, WA 6006

Wind Classification	T.B.C.	Amendments
Local Authority	City of Vincent	
Dwn:	Daniel Zhao	
Plot Date:	24/11/2022 at 5:15 PM	

Signatures:
Client: _____
Client: _____
Builder: _____

Sections DA01

Rev No.	5.01
Job No.	5109
Rev No.	N/A.

Determination Advice Notes:

1. This is a development approval issued under the City of Vincent Local Planning Scheme No. 2 and the Metropolitan Region Scheme only. It is not a building permit or an approval to commence or carry out development under any other law. It is the responsibility of the applicant/owner to obtain any other necessary approvals and to commence and carry out development in accordance with all other laws.
2. If the development the subject of this approval is not substantially commenced within a period of two years, or another period specified in the approval after the date of determination, the approval will lapse and be of no further effect.
3. Where an approval has so lapsed, no development must be carried out without the further approval of the local government having first been sought and obtained.
4. If an applicant or owner is aggrieved by this determination there is a right of review by the State Administrative Tribunal in accordance with the *Planning and Development Act 2005* Part 14. An application must be made within 28 days of the determination.
5. This approval is not an authority to ignore any constraint to development on the land, which may exist through statute, regulation, contract or on title, such as an easement or restrictive covenant. It is the responsibility of the applicant and not the City to investigate any such constraints before commencing development. This approval will not necessarily have regard to any such constraint to development, regardless of whether or not it has been drawn to the City's attention.
6. The applicant is responsible for ensuring that all lot boundaries as shown on the approved plans are correct.
7. NO verge trees shall be removed. The verge trees shall be RETAINED and PROTECTED from any damage including unauthorised pruning.
8. An Infrastructure Protection Bond together with a non-refundable inspection fee shall be lodged with the City by the applicant, prior to the commencement of works, and will be held until all building/development works have been completed and any disturbance of, or damage to the City's infrastructure, including verge trees, has been repaired/reinstated to the satisfaction of the City. An application for the refund of the bond shall be made in writing. The bond is non-transferable.
9. The movement of all path users, with or without disabilities, within the road reserve, shall not be impeded in any way during the course of the building works. This area shall be maintained in a safe and trafficable condition and a continuous path of travel (minimum width 1.5 metres) shall be maintained for all users at all times during construction works. Permits are required for placement of any material within the road reserve.
10. The owners of the subject land shall obtain the consent of the owners of relevant adjoining properties before entering those properties in order to make good the boundary walls.
11. All stormwater produced on the subject land shall be retained on site, by suitable means to the full satisfaction of the City. No further consideration shall be given to the disposal of stormwater 'offsite' without the submission of a geotechnical report from a qualified consultant. Should approval to dispose of stormwater 'offsite' be subsequently provided, detailed design drainage plans and associated calculations for the proposed stormwater disposal shall be lodged together with the building permit application working drawings.
12. All new crossovers to lots are subject to a separate application to be approved by the City. All new crossovers shall be constructed in accordance with the City's Standard Crossover Specifications, which specify that the portion of the existing footpath traversing the proposed crossover (subject to the footpath being in good condition as determined by the Infrastructure and Environment Services Directorate), must be retained. The proposed crossover levels shall match into the existing footpath levels. Should the footpath not to be in satisfactory condition, it must be

Determination Advice Notes:

replaced with in-situ concrete panels in accordance with the City's specification for reinstatement of concrete paths.