

Evaluation of Council's grounds of objection to 8 storey development against proposed 7 storey development.

<b>No.</b>	<b>Town of Cottesloe reasons of objection to 8 Storey Proposal</b>	<b>Has reason of objection been resolved in 7 Storey Proposal (Yes/No/Comment)</b>
<b>1</b>	The height of the proposed development is not consistent with the requirements of LPS3 as it exceeds the building height limit of five (5) storeys and 21 metres that was established through an Enquiry-by-Design process;	No. Proposal is seven (7) storeys with a max height of 24.9m. Previous proposal was 8 Storeys and 27.1m (2.2m). Height of development is still non-compliant.
<b>2</b>	The proposed development projects into the minimum front, side and rear boundary setbacks that are prescribed by Schedule 15 of LPS3;	No. Setbacks are still non-compliant.
<b>3</b>	The height of the proposed development coupled with a nil setback on the southern boundary will cause increased overshadowing of adjoining and adjacent properties including parts of the beach foreshore which will adversely affect the amenity of the locality and is contrary to State Planning Policy No.2.6 - Coastal Planning Policy;	No. Other than a north-south section with an indicative winter solstice sun angle there is no other information illustrating overshadowing of the adjoining properties. It is therefore difficult to support the claim in the officer's report to the WAPC that overshadowing concerns have been resolved.
<b>4</b>	The height and bulk of the proposed development will adversely impact on important views to and from the Cottesloe Civic Centre which conflicts with the objective of the Foreshore Centre zone under Clause 4.2.3(d) of LPS3 and the endorsed Conservation Plan for the Cottesloe Civic Centre;	No. Though 2.2m lower than previous proposal, a max height of 21 m was set to preserve views as per LPS3.
<b>5</b>	The size and composition of the multiple dwellings does not provide sufficient housing choice and variety in accordance with aims and objectives of the Foreshore Centre Zone of LPS3;	No. The proposed development does not satisfy clause 6.4.3.1(d) of LPS3 and proposed development has minimum diversity of apartment types.
<b>6</b>	Vehicle access to and from Marine Parade is proposed via a single vehicle width crossover and no alternative vehicle access plan or arrangement has been provided to demonstrate how rear access can be achieved in future;	No. Although it is proposed to include a condition requiring adjoining landowners when they develop to provide for access easements to the rear of Lot 500, no easement is provided across Lot 500 to enable this future access easement connection. As rear access will only become available if and when neighbouring properties redeveloped the timeframe for satisfying this condition is unknown and therefore the temporary access will in affect become permanent.

<b>7</b>	The provision of vehicle access to Marine Parade conflicts with the Cottesloe Foreshore Master Plan that aims to restrict vehicle access to Marine Parade along this portion of the foreshore;	No – See above.
<b>8</b>	The car lift operation requirements, coupled with access to and from the site via a single driveway from Marine Parade, will cause traffic conflict and delay to vehicles using this section of Marine Parade and create an unsafe environment for pedestrians and cyclists;	No – See above, however car lift will be serviced quarterly.
<b>9</b>	The proposed waste management arrangements for the development application are unacceptable as they are reliant on the waste collection vehicle crossing the median strip and reversing into the narrow single driveway thereby blocking access to the car lift;	No. Waste Collection process, either option 1 or 2 not supported.
<b>10</b>	The shortfall of commercial parking bays requires further justification;	No. Commercial parking reduced and there is no Residential Visitor parking. The proposal does not meet LPS parking requirements.
<b>11</b>	The scale of the job creation for the project is considered marginal and rather insignificant in terms of meeting the criteria as a significant development that represents broad ranging benefits for the State.	No. Fulltime jobs created during construction change is 65 to 66 (1) and ongoing could be seven to eight (1). Development reliant on presale contracts (shovel ready?)