PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT FOR

RODRIGUEZ

LOT 7 #296 KEYMER STREET CLOVERDALE 158025



City of Belmont RECEIVED 27 May 2020 Application No: 201/2020

100 - 999 ENPLOYEES







(Project/Volume Builder) Summit Homes Group

BUILT AROUND PEOPLE.

NEW HOMES RENOVATIONS GRANNY FLATS



DEVELOPMENTS





A4

MIT CLEENT (S): SHED FRONT ELEV SCALE 1:100	ATION SIDE ELEVAT SCALE 1:100	COLORBOND ON 1 SCALE 1:100	N 2 REAR ELEVATION SCALE 1:100
SUN SHADOW AT NOON 21 JU 2c FACE BRICK - 1/3RD BOND NOTE: DRAWING SUBJECT TO LOCAL		_	
PROPOSED RESIDENCE FOR: RODRIGUEZ ADDRESS: LOT 7 #296 KEYMER STREET CLOVERDALE	DRAWN: RC SCALE: 1: DESIGNED: RC SHEET: 2:0 CHECKED: #Checked SIZE: A: DATE: 22.08.2019 PROJECTS MODEL: JOB N° IS8025	P2 RC 08.10.2019 P5 P3 RC 13.11.2019 P4 RC 21.11.2019	ue Name Drawn Date SUMMIT HOMES GROUP BUILD RENOVATE DEVELO
BUILT AROUND PEOPLE			Copyright © 2019



A5

DEVELOP

S O B		A: 16.22 m2					
BUILDER: CLIENT(S):		TOTAL AREA A: 212.88 m2					
		EXCLUSIVE LO CPA TOTAL SITE AR BUILDING ARE OPEN SPACE	EA	325.78 m ² 49.30 m ² 375.08 m ² 193.23 m ² 48.48 %			
		ZONING TOTAL SITE AREA	R20/40(746 m²	TO BE ASS	ESSED	AS R30)	
PROPOSED RESIDENCE FOR: RODRIGUEZ ADDRESS:			lssue Name P2 P3 P4	Drawn Date RC 08.10.2019 RC 13.11.2019 RC 21.11.2019	Issue Name	Drawn Date	SUMMIT
LOT 7 #296 KEYMER STREET CLOVERDALE	^{MODEL:} #Model Type	IOB N°	FEAS_DA	FLOOR PLAN (A	(3 V)		HOMES GROUP
BUILT AROUND PEOPLE					Copyrigh	t© 2019	



GF 0c				2c FACE BRICK _7c		
<u>ELEVATIO</u>	<u>N 4</u>					
COLOURS FOR ILLUSTRATIVE	PURPOSES ONLY					
PROPOSED RESIDENCE FOR: RODRIGUEZ ADDRESS:	DRAWN: RC DESIGNED: RC CHECKED: #Checked DATE: 22.08.2019	SCALE: 1:100 SHEET: 4 OF 5 SIZE: A3 PROJECTS	Issue Name Drawn P2 RC P3 RC P4 RC	Date Issue Name 08.10.2019 13.11.2019 21.11.2019 14.11.2019	Drawn Date	SUMMIT
LOT 7 #296 KEYMER STREET CLOVERDALE BUILT AROUND PEOPLE	MODEL: #Model Type	јов № 158025	FEAS_DA ELEV	ATIONS (A3 V) (1) Copyrig	ht © 2019	HOMES GROUP



68 Canning Highway, South Perth WA 6151 t: (08) 9474 1449 c: contact@altusplan.com.au www.altusplan.com.au

12 May 2020

Chief Executive Officer City of Belmont 215 Wright Street CLOVERDALE WA 6105

Via email: <u>belmont@belmont.wa.gov.au</u>

Dear Stephen,

Submission on Proposed Grouped Dwelling, Lot 7 (No. 296) Keymer Street, Cloverdale

This submission has been prepared by Altus Planning on behalf of the landowner, Marlon Rodriguez ('client'), of No. 296 Keymer Street, Cloverdale. Our instructions have been to provide planning justification for the proposed grouped dwelling at No. 296 Keymer Street, Cloverdale ('subject land' or 'site').

The plans referred to in this submission are those prepared by Summit Homes (Issue P4 – 21.11.2019) however, any queries more broadly of a planning nature should be directed to Altus Planning.

We are aware that the current proposal does not satisfy all the applicable Deemed-to-Comply requirements under the Residential Design Codes Volume 1 ('R-Codes') and therefore the proposal requires advertisement and to be assessed against the relevant Design Principles. Furthermore, it is also understood that the existing dwelling does not satisfy the requirement identified under clause 5.7.3(c) of the City of Belmont ('City') Local Planning Scheme No. 15 ('LPS15' or 'Scheme') and therefore requires Council determination.

City of Belmont RECEIVED 25/05/2020 Application No: 201/2020

The subject land exists as a 746m² lot zoned 'Residential' with a dual density coding of R20/40 under the City's LPS15. Furthermore, the subject land exists with a brick and tile single dwelling, with the surrounding area characterised by similar single dwellings as well as grouped dwellings.

The proposed development is for a four (4) bedroom single storey grouped dwelling at the rear of the existing dwelling, seeking approval under the higher density code applicable for the area.

Subdivision Approval

On 18 March 2020, the Western Australian Planning Commission ('WAPC') conditionally approved a survey strata subdivision (WAPC ref: 1176-19) over the subject land allowing for the site to be subdivided into two (2) lots measuring $325m^2$ and $326m^2$, with a common property access leg of $95m^2$.

The WAPC approval included the following conditions:

- 1. Prior to the Western Australian Planning Commission's endorsement of a diagram or plan of survey (deposited plan) for the creation of the lots proposed by this application, an application for development approval for building(s) on the lot(s) is to be granted. (Local Government)
- 3. All buildings and effluent disposal systems having the necessary clearance from the new boundaries as required under the relevant legislation including the Local Planning Scheme, Building Act 2011, and National Construction Code Series/Building Code of Australia (as amended). (Local Government)

Design Principles Assessment

The proposed grouped dwelling seeks development approval against the R30 density code.

City of Belmont RECEIVED 25/05/2020 Application No: 201/2020 2

Lot Boundary Setback – North-west

The setback of the Living and Dining rooms to the north-west boundary does not satisfy the applicable deemed-to-comply requirement. Specifically, the proposed setback is 1.01m in lieu of the required setback under Table 2B of the R-Codes, which is 1.5m.

Accordingly, the proposed setback must be assessed against and demonstrate achievement of the relevant Design Principles of the R-Codes. Section 5.1.3 Lot Boundary setback states as follows:

Design Principle	Response
P3.1 Buildings set back from lot boundaries or adjacent buildings on the same lot so as to:	
 reduce impacts of building bulk on adjoining properties; 	The proposal is for a single storey dwelling, with only the upper courses of brickwork and roof being visible above the dividing fence line. Furthermore, the subject wall directly abuts a large shed located at No. 294 Keymer Street and as a result will not have any impact on an existing outdoor living area or habitable room of the neighbouring dwelling. Accordingly, the proposed setback does not result in any adverse building bulk on
 provide adequate direct sun and ventilation to the building and open spaces on the site and adjoining properties; and 	adjoining properties. The subject wall abuts the north-western boundary, thus being south of the neighbouring site and not resulting in any overshadowing of the adjoining property. Furthermore, as identified above, the wall abuts an existing shed and will not have any

City of Belmont RECEIVED 25/05/2020 Application No: 201/2020 3

	impacts on the outdoor living area or any habitable rooms of the dwelling at No. 294 Keymer Street.
	It is submitted that the proposed setback will not adversely impact the access to direct sunlight and ventilation for the subject site or neighbouring property.
 minimise the extent of overlooking and resultant loss of privacy on adjoining properties. 	The subject wall includes major openings to both the Living and Dining rooms.
	Notwithstanding this, the existing 1.8m high dividing fence acts as privacy screening to the major openings eliminating any potential for overlooking or loss of privacy on adjoining properties.

Lot Boundary Setback – South-west

Similarly, the proposed setback to the south-western boundary does not satisfy the applicable deemed-to-comply requirement. Specifically, the subject wall(s) is setback a minimum of 1.0m in lieu of the 1.5m that is required by Table 2b of the R-Codes for a wall with major openings that is 3.5m or less in height, regardless of the overall length.

Accordingly, this proposed setback must also be assessed against and demonstrate achievement of the relevant Design Principles at clause 5.1.3 of the R-Codes.

Design Principle	Response
P3.1 Buildings set back from lot boundaries or adjacent buildings on the same lot so as to:	
 reduce impacts of building bulk on adjoining properties; 	Again, the proposal is for a single storey dwelling, with only the upper courses of

City of Belmont RECEIVED 25/05/2020 Application No: 201/2020

	brickwork and roof being visible above the dividing fence line. Furthermore, the subject
	wall directly abuts two (2) sheds on the adjoining property at 11 Kelly Street and as a result will not have any impact on any existing outdoor living area or habitable room of the neighbouring dwelling.
	Accordingly, the proposed setback does not result in any adverse building bulk on adjoining properties.
 provide adequate direct sun and ventilation to the building and open spaces on the site and adjoining properties; and 	The overshadowing diagram on the floor plan demonstrates that the shadow cast at midday, 21 June will extend no further than the walls of the existing sheds at No. 11 Kelly Street and therefore will not adversely impact on any habitable rooms or active open spaces on the adjoining property.
	In addition, as the existing sheds on the adjoining property have similar lot boundary setbacks to the proposed development, it is considered that the subject site will achieve sufficient access to direct sun and ventilation.
 minimise the extent of overlooking and resultant loss of privacy on adjoining properties. 	The subject wall includes major openings to Bed 1, Bed 3 and the Living room, with a highlight window to the Theatre.
	Notwithstanding this, it is again submitted that the existing 1.8m high dividing fence acts as privacy screening to the major openings and thereby eliminates any

City of Belmont RECEIVED 25/05/2020 Application No: 201/2020 5

potential for overlooking or loss of privacy on adjoining properties.

Local Planning Scheme No. 15 Assessment

Clause 5.7.3(c) of LPS15 states the following with regard to development seeking approval under the higher density code of flexible coded Residential areas:

"Development comprising of two or more dwellings in a front to rear arrangement achieves a minimum side setback of 6 metres between the side wall of the first dwelling fronting the public street and the side boundary of the parent lot."

It is submitted that the existing dwelling on-site has a 5.2m setback from the chimney to the south-eastern boundary, with the remainder of the south-eastern facing wall having a 5.7m setback. These existing setbacks fall 0.3m - 0.8m short of the 6m setback required under clause 5.7.3(c) of LPS15.

Notwithstanding the above, when having consideration to the entire dwelling and its relationship with the south-eastern boundary, the average setback is approximately 7.46m. This average setback is considered to be a more accurate depiction of the perceived setback from the adjoining neighbour at No. 298 Keymer Street.

In addition to the above, we have identified or been made aware of the following examples within the immediate locality where a variation has been permitted to this clause (refer to example photos enclosed as Attachment 1):

- No. 377 Daly Street, Cloverdale setback 4.74m
- No. 379 Daly Street, Cloverdale setback 4.74m
- No. 165 Williamson Avenue, Cloverdale setback 4.7m
- No. 44 McKeon Street, Redcliffe setback 5.18m
- No. 295 Keymer Street, Cloverdale setback 5.1m
- No. 30 Orpington Street, Cloverdale setback 4.2m
- No. 290 Keymer Street, Cloverdale setback appears to be compliant, however a 1.8m high colorbond fence has been erected between the dwelling and the access leg making the setback redundant.

City of Belmont RECEIVED 25/05/2020 Application No: 201/2020 6

It is submitted that the intent of the above clause is considered more relevant to new developments of a larger scale that would be more likely to result in adverse building bulk on adjoining properties if protruding within the 6m side setback. Having regard to the scale of the proposed development and the existing dwelling on-site, the variation to clause 5.7.3(c) of LPS15 is not considered to result in any adverse amenity impacts on the adjoining property at No. 298 Keymer Street.

Furthermore, given the conditional subdivision approval from the WAPC, the subdivision of the lot is not considered objectional if development approval can be granted. It is submitted that very little would be gained from requiring the existing dwelling to be modified so that the existing chimney is removed and technical compliance with the setback requirement is achieved. This would not have any meaningful impact on the amenity of the adjoining neighbour or on the streetscape generally.

Accordingly, the variation is considered to be minor and will not set a further precedent for future proposals, especially new development of a larger scale that, if this setback was varied, could potentially result in adverse amenity impacts on adjoining properties. Furthermore, the permitting of this variation would not prejudice the requirement for any future redevelopment (of the existing front dwelling) on this site to adhere to the required setback.

Comment

Considering the density potential permitted for the locality to allow for considerable infill development, it is submitted that the setbacks proposed are minor and would not set an undesirable precedent for future development.

In this instance, the perceived setback of the existing dwelling to the south-eastern boundary is greater than what exists when taking into consideration the entirety of the dwelling. In addition, the setback of the proposed grouped dwelling to the rear is considered to achieve the relevant design principles under the R-Codes and also will not result in any adverse impacts on the adjoining properties to the north-west and south-west.

Having regard to the quoted design principles of the R-Codes and given the existing examples within the immediate locality, in my opinion the proposed development will have an acceptable planning and built form outcome.

City of Belmont RECEIVED 25/05/2020 Application No: 201/2020

Should any matters raised above require clarification, I can be contacted on Ph. 9474 1449 or via email at joe@altusplan.com.au.

Yours sincerely,

fin

Joe Algeri Director – Altus Planning



TOWN PLANNING | MEDIATION | ADVOCACY

8

Attachment 1 – Example Photos

City of Belmont RECEIVED 25/05/2020 Application No: 201/2020



30 Orpington Street, Cloverdale



A16



295 Keymer Street, Cloverdale





290 Keymer Street, Cloverdale



TOWN PLANNING | MEDIATION | ADVOCACY

12