

TOWN OF COTTESLOE



DEVELOPMENT SERVICES COMMITTEE MINUTES

MAYOR'S PARLOUR, COTTESLOE CIVIC CENTRE
109 BROOME STREET, COTTESLOE
6.00 PM, MONDAY, 17 MAY 2010

CARL ASKEW
Chief Executive Officer

20 May 2010

DEVELOPMENT SERVICES COMMITTEE
TABLE OF CONTENTS

ITEM	SUBJECT	PAGE NO
1	DECLARATION OF MEETING OPENING/ANNOUNCEMENT OF VISITORS.....	1
2	RECORD OF ATTENDANCE/APOLOGIES/LEAVE OF ABSENCE (PREVIOUSLY APPROVED).....	1
3	RESPONSE TO PREVIOUS PUBLIC QUESTIONS TAKEN ON NOTICE.....	1
4	PUBLIC QUESTION TIME.....	1
5	PUBLIC STATEMENT TIME.....	1
6	APPLICATIONS FOR LEAVE OF ABSENCE.....	2
7	CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING.....	2
8	ANNOUNCEMENTS BY PRESIDING MEMBER WITHOUT DISCUSSION.....	2
9	PETITIONS/DEPUTATIONS/PRESENTATIONS.....	2
10	REPORTS OF COMMITTEES AND OFFICERS.....	3
10.1	PLANNING.....	3
10.1.1	2 ALEXANDRA AVENUE - SWIMMING POOL AND ALTERATIONS AND ADDITIONS TO TWO STOREY DWELLING WITH UNDERCROFT.....	3
10.1.2	7 AVONMORE TERRACE - TWO STOREY DWELLING WITH UNDERCROFT AND SWIMMING POOL.....	8
10.1.3	10 GRANT STREET – TWO-STOREY DWELLING WITH ROOF-DECK, UNDERCROFT AND POOL.....	20
11	ELECTED MEMBERS' MOTIONS OF WHICH PREVIOUS NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN.....	23
12	NEW BUSINESS OF AN URGENT NATURE INTRODUCED BY ELECTED MEMBERS/OFFICERS BY DECISION OF MEETING.....	23
13	MEETING CLOSURE.....	23

1 DECLARATION OF MEETING OPENING/ANNOUNCEMENT OF VISITORS

The Presiding Officer announced the meeting opened at 6:06 PM.

**2 RECORD OF ATTENDANCE/APOLOGIES/LEAVE OF ABSENCE
(PREVIOUSLY APPROVED)****Present**

Cr Jack Walsh	Presiding Member
Cr Jay Birnbrauer	
Cr Patricia Carmichael	
Cr Davina Goldthorpe	
Cr Jo Dawkins	
Cr Victor Strzina	
Cr Ian Woodhill	

Officers Present

Mr Andrew Jackson	Manager Development Services
Mr Ed Drewett	Senior Planning Officer
Mr Will Schaefer	Planning Officer
Ms Pauline Dyer	Development Services Secretary

Apologies

Mr Carl Askew	Chief Executive Officer
---------------	-------------------------

Officer Apologies

Nil

Leave of Absence (previously approved)

Nil

3 RESPONSE TO PREVIOUS PUBLIC QUESTIONS TAKEN ON NOTICE

Nil

4 PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

Nil

5 PUBLIC STATEMENT TIME

David Hartree, re 10 Grant Street, Cottesloe, Item 10.1.3 – Two-Storey Dwelling With Roof-Deck, Undercroft And Pool

Mr Hartree referred to his email to Councillors last Friday and handed-out A3 coloured copies of the plans, which he spoke to. Mr Hartee explained the design approach in relation to the topography, basement parking, building

height, roof terrace, sustainability features, views, privacy, streetscape and materials/finishes; to demonstrate that the additional half a metre height sought would be ameliorated by the sunken site and relative scale of nearby dwellings. He looked forward to Council's support for the proposal.

Kim Stirling, re 7 Avonmore Terrace, Cottesloe, Item 10.1.2 – Two-Storey Dwelling with Undercroft and Swimming Pool

Mr Stirling outlined the difficult site with steep fall and the design in relation to the NGL, layout, access, courtyards and other aspects of the dwelling. He indicated that it may be difficult to lower the undercroft and explained that it was only a portion of the pyramidal roof which caused the maximum additional height. Mr Stirling hoped for favourable consideration of the proposal and mentioned that the prospective subdivision may be an alternative to achieve greater compliance.

6 APPLICATIONS FOR LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Nil

7 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

Moved Cr Strzina, seconded Cr Dawkins

[Minutes March 15 2010 Development Services Committee.doc](#)

The Minutes of the Ordinary meeting of the Development Services Committee, held on 15 March 2010 be confirmed.

Carried 7/0

8 ANNOUNCEMENTS BY PRESIDING MEMBER WITHOUT DISCUSSION

Nil

9 PETITIONS/DEPUTATIONS/PRESENTATIONS

Nil

10 REPORTS OF COMMITTEES AND OFFICERS**10.1 PLANNING****10.1.1 2 ALEXANDRA AVENUE - SWIMMING POOL AND ALTERATIONS AND ADDITIONS TO TWO STOREY DWELLING WITH UNDERCROFT**

File No:	1933
Attachments:	2AlexAerialPhoto.pdf 2AlexSitePhotos.pdf 2AlexPlans.pdf 2Alex3DDrawing.pdf 2AlexApplicantJustif.pdf
Responsible Officer:	Carl Askew Chief Executive Officer
Author:	William Schaefer Planning Officer
Proposed Meeting Date:	17 May 2010
Author Disclosure of Interest:	Nil
Property Owner:	Mrs Jane Carter
Applicant:	Walter Hunter and Penny Watson Architects Pty Ltd
Date of Application:	1 April 2010
Zoning:	Residential – R20
Use:	P - A use that is permitted under this Scheme
Lot Area:	1342m²
M.R.S. Reservation:	Not applicable

SUMMARY

This application is seeking the following variation to Council's Scheme:

- Building height

This item is discussed in this report and refers to plans received on 1 April 2010.

Given the assessment that has been undertaken, the recommendation is to conditionally approve the application.

PROPOSAL

It is proposed to construct a swimming pool, extend the undercroft area, make minor ground floor alterations and add rooms including a bedroom and balcony to the upper floor of the two storey dwelling at the above address.

Most of the upper floor alterations are proposed to be within the existing roof and will not alter the external profile of the building.

The house dates back to the 1930s but appears to have been extensively altered since its construction and does not occur on the Municipal Inventory. It is evident that great care has been taken by the owner and architects to match the original style of the dwelling.

The dwelling is situated on a 1341m² double lot which is bordered to the west and north by a 3.4 m wide ROW. The nearest neighbouring property is 8.0m from the second storey additions so all dwelling setbacks easily comply with provisions of RDC. No retaining or fill is proposed and all privacy setbacks comply with the Acceptable Development Standards of the RDC. Open space and outdoor living requirements are easily fulfilled and the shadow would fall only on the subject lot/road reserve.

STRATEGIC IMPLICATIONS

Nil

POLICY IMPLICATIONS

Building height

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

Nil

STATUTORY ENVIRONMENT

- Town of Cottesloe Town Planning Scheme No 2
- Residential Design Codes

SUSTAINABILITY IMPLICATIONS

Nil

CONSULTATION

Advertising

- The Application was advertised as per Town of Cottesloe Town Planning Scheme No 2 and Residential Design Codes;
- The advertising consisted of letters to surrounding property owners.
- No written submissions were received.

PROPOSED LOCAL PLANNING SCHEME NO 3

Proposed LPS3 has no bearing on this application.

HERITAGE LISTING

N/A

VARIATIONS

Scheme Clause	Required	Provided
TPS2 Clause 5.1.1 (c) Building Height	6.0m maximum wall height, 8.5m maximum ridge height.	6.58m wall height, 8.87m maximum ridge height.

APPLICANT'S JUSTIFICATION

The applicant has submitted the following justification:

- The neighbouring properties will not be overshadowed by the additions;
- No visual privacy issues have been generated;
- A 3.4m wide ROW separates the property from the western and northern neighbours and the dwelling is set back approximately 14.8m from the eastern neighbour;
- Materials and colours will match the existing dwelling;
- The alterations and additions will modernise the interior of an older building and restore the exterior to its original state.

PLANNING COMMENT**Building height**

It is proposed to construct second floor additions with wall heights that are 6.58m above the NGL, whereas the Clause 5.1.1 (c) of TPS2 sets a wall height of 6.0m. The maximum ridge height of the additions is proposed to be 8.87m above the NGL, in lieu of the 8.5m normally permitted by the Scheme.

Clause 5.1.1 (c) contemplates allowing relaxations to the height standards in cases of extensions to existing buildings. The proposed additions qualify as extensions to a substantial existing dwelling and may therefore be considered as allowable.

The additions will have little impact on the amenity of the surrounding area as they are not readily visible from the street. As the midwinter shadow from the additions would fall entirely on the subject lot and road reserve, the additions would have little adverse impact on neighbouring properties. The additions do not affect views of significance to the neighbours and have been sensitively designed to complement the existing building.

No objections were received.

CONCLUSION

The proposed upper floor additions are expected to perform with no impact on amenity and may be supported under the Scheme. No planning issues are associated with the remainder of the proposal.

Approval is recommended.

VOTING

Simple Majority

OFFICER AND COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

Moved Cr Dawkins, seconded Cr Birnbrauer

That Council:

GRANT its Approval to Commence Development for the proposed swimming pool and alterations and additions to two storey dwelling with undercroft on Lots 36 and 37 (No 2) Alexandra Avenue, Claremont, in accordance with the plans submitted on 1 April 2010, subject to the following conditions:

- (a) All construction work shall be carried out in accordance with the Environmental Protection (Noise) Regulations 1997, Regulation 13 - Construction Sites.
- (b) Stormwater runoff from any portion of the site shall not be discharged onto the street reserve, ROW or adjoining properties, and the gutters and downpipes used for the disposal of stormwater runoff from roofed areas shall be included within the working drawings for a building licence.
- (c) The external profile of the development as shown on the approved plans shall not be changed, whether by the addition of any service plant, fitting, fixture or otherwise, except with the written consent of Council.
- (d) Air-conditioning plant and equipment shall be located closer to the dwelling than the adjoining dwellings, and suitably housed or treated as may be necessary, so as to ensure that sound levels emitted shall not exceed those outlined in the Environmental Protection (Noise) Regulations 1997.
- (e) Any fencing and gating to the site within the front setback area shall be of an open-aspect design in accordance with the Town's Fencing Local Law and the subject of a separate application to Council.
- (f) Lots 36 and 37 shall be amalgamated as per the existing WAPC approval prior to the completion of works.
- (g) The pool pump and filter shall be located closer to the dwelling than the adjoining dwellings and housed or treated to ensure that noise emissions do not exceed the levels prescribed by the Environmental Protection (Noise) Regulations 1997.
- (h) Wastewater or backwash water from swimming pool filtration systems shall be disposed of into adequate soakwells and contained within the boundary of the property.
- (i) A soakwell system having a minimum capacity of 763 litres and located a minimum of 1.8metres away from any building or boundary shall be installed to the satisfaction of the Environmental Health Officer.

- (j) Wastewater or backwash water shall not be disposed of into the Council's street drainage system or the Water Corporation's sewer.

Advice Note:

The applicant/owner is responsible for ensuring that all lot boundaries shown on the approved plans are correct and that the proposed development occurs entirely within the owner's property.

Carried 7/0

10.1.27 AVONMORE TERRACE - TWO STOREY DWELLING WITH UNDERCROFT AND SWIMMING POOL

File No: 1862
Attachments: [AerialPhoto7Avonmore.pdf](#)
[SitePhotos7Avonmore.pdf](#)
[Plans21April7Avonmore.pdf](#)
[NeighbourComments7Avonmore.pdf](#)
[ApplicantJustification7Avonmore.pdf](#)
[OwnerJustif7Avonmore.pdf](#)

Responsible Officer: Carl Askew
Chief Executive Officer

Author: William Schaefer
Planning Officer

Proposed Meeting Date: 17 May 2010

Author Disclosure of Interest: Nil
Property Owner: Kathleen E Prosser
Applicant: Kim Stirling Architects
Date of Application 4 January 2010, Revised Plans received 24 February 2010, 9 April 2010 and 21 April 2010

Zoning: Residential – R30
Use: P - A use that is permitted under this Scheme
Lot Area: 1029 m²
M.R.S. Reservation: Not applicable

SUMMARY

This application is seeking the following variations to Council's Scheme and the Residential Design Codes:

- Building height;
- Front setback;

Each of these aspects is discussed in this report and refers to revised plans received on 21 April 2010.

Given the assessment that has been undertaken, the recommendation is to conditionally approve the application.

PROPOSAL

It is proposed to construct a two storey dwelling with an undercroft and swimming pool in the eastern portion of this prominent corner site.

The site is steeply sloped, falling approximately 5.76m from east to west along its 45.26m length, and may be regarded as the sort of lot for which variations to the 6.0m and 8.5m building heights are sometimes supported.

An architect-designed, two-storey brick and iron dwelling dating to the late 1980s presently occupies the site. A substantially overheight limestone fence presents to the street boundaries of the lot.

The plans proposed have been arrived at through extensive liaison with Council Staff that dates back to November 2009.

STRATEGIC IMPLICATIONS

Nil

POLICY IMPLICATIONS

- Building height;
- Resolution TP128a October 2002: Front Setbacks.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

Nil

STATUTORY ENVIRONMENT

- Town of Cottesloe Town Planning Scheme No 2
- Residential Design Codes

SUSTAINABILITY IMPLICATIONS

Nil

PROPOSED LOCAL PLANNING SCHEME NO 3

Proposed LPS3 has no bearing on this proposal.

VARIATIONS

Town Planning Scheme/Resolutions

Scheme Resolution	Clause/	Required	Provided
TPS2 Clauses 5.1.1 (a) and 5.1.1 (c) Undercroft and Building Height		Undercroft no higher than NGL at centre of site. 6.0m maximum wall heights, 8.5m maximum ridge heights.	Undercroft 0.2m above NGL at centre of site. 6.85m wall height, 9.35m maximum ridge height with apex of pyramidal roof at 9.55m.
Resolution October 2002	TP128a	6.0m front setback for residential development in the district; however, it is noted the RDC could allow a 4.0m setback in this circumstance.	4.522m

MUNICIPAL INVENTORY

The dwelling is listed as Category 6. Notes for this management category state: "Modern Dwelling – Future Heritage or Recycled Building. Assess in more detail when considering a development application."

Council's heritage advisor has considered the proposal and does not raise any objections to the demolition of the existing dwelling. It is intended to condition the approval to ensure that a full photographic record of the place is submitted prior to the issue of a Building Licence.

APPLICANT'S JUSTIFICATION

The applicant has supplied the following written justification:

- Dwelling is architect designed and a worthy replacement for the large dwelling that presently occupies the prominent site;
- Lot is potentially subdivisible into 3 lots. Single dwelling currently proposed is likely to have significantly less impact on amenity of neighbourhood than 3 new single dwellings;
- Dwelling is substantially sunk beneath road level on both sides and is not expected to present as unduly massive to street or neighbours;
- Need to maximise features of site has necessitated location of proposed dwelling at top of site, near Avonmore Terrace. A much more eco-friendly house design has been enabled by placement of the dwelling at the top of the site;
- Building height variation only 200mm if property is formally subdivided. Variation will not have negative effect on amenity of neighbours;
- Staggered effect of Princes Street elevation ameliorates impact of reduced setback.

Advertising

- The Application was advertised as per Town of Cottesloe Town Planning Scheme No 2 and Residential Design Codes;
- Advertising consisted of letters to adjoining and surrounding property owners.
- Two written submissions were received. Outlines of the submissions are as follows:

MR MICHAEL BEECH, 5A AVONMORE TERRACE, COTTESLOE

- No apparent objection to any aspect of the proposal;
- Request for dilapidation report prior to commencement of works.

MS FREDDI WILKINSON, 1/9 PRINCES STREET, COTTESLOE

- Reduced street setback will impact sight lines to ocean;

- 700mm height variation (shown on plans dated 24 February 2010) excessive given height of adjoining structures;
- Request for confirmation that tree and walls on corner of Avonmore Terrace and Princes Street will be removed;
- Request for management of building activity during construction period.

PLANNING COMMENT

Building Height

ASSESSMENT BASED ON EXISTING LOT DIMENSIONS

Four-corner averaging for the existing site gives a NGL datum of 25.15m. Based on this datum, the wall height of the dwelling is 0.85m above the 6.0m maximum prescribed by Clause 5.1.1 (c) of TPS2. The main ridge level is also 0.85m over the 8.5m height limit, with the maximum height of the pyramidal loggia roof 1.05m overheight.

It is noted that as per the requirements of TPS2 the undercroft does not constitute habitable space. Despite that, the ceiling of the undercroft is 0.2m above the level arrived at by following the formula given, which provides that the space is below (ie not higher than) the natural ground level measured at the centre of the site as determined by Council. On this basis the undercroft could be assessed to qualify as a storey, and the dwelling would therefore be regarded as a three-storey proposal, which is not permitted by the Scheme. In this regard it is observed that the undercroft floor-to-ceiling height of 2.7m is relatively generous, which, as well as the gradient of the access ramp, should be able to be modified to achieve compliance with the Scheme. In turn, depending on the design of the balance of the dwelling and its interconnection with the undercroft, the modification may achieve a corresponding reduction in the height of the overall dwelling. A condition is recommended accordingly.

The overheight portions of building must be assessed as variations to Clause 5.1.1 (c) of TPS2, which gives Council discretion to vary from the height requirement in "particular cases where natural ground forms indicate that a variation is warranted provided that the amenity of neighbouring areas is not unreasonably diminished."

The applicant has supplied the following justification for the height variations:

- The high, eastern portion of the lot is the logical choice for the location of the proposed new dwelling as it maximises the best features of the site. It is the need to situate the dwelling here, rather than an inappropriate scale of development, that has generated the necessity of applying for a variation;
- The 1031m² lot could either support a single dwelling with a footprint of more than 550m² or subdivision into three 300 m² + lots, each of which could be 55% developed. The proposed dwelling may be overheight but it is relatively modest given what could be approved for the site;
- The proposal preserves the views of neighbours by keeping much of the lot free from development;

- The modest dimensions of the proposed dwelling ensure that little shadow falls on the properties adjoining to the south;
- The “resort style” of the design is consistent with the ocean themes of Cottesloe and is an appropriate replacement for the dwelling that occupies the prominent site at present.

Central to consideration of the above is Council’s tradition of assessing height against a fixed, horizontal line above the centre of site rather than against a height-line that follows the contours of the land at all points. Under such a formula, any dwelling proposed for the high section of a large, sloping lot is likely to require Council discretion for height.

In this instance the slope of the lot is considerable, falling approximately 5.76m from east to west across the Princes Street frontage. If the lot were flat, there would probably be no need for a variation, and the request for such before Council is arguably the function of the “natural ground form” that is contemplated by TPS2.

With the “natural ground form” argument deemed sufficient, it remains to determine whether “the amenity of neighbouring areas is not unreasonably diminished”.

As TPS2 does not particularly define “amenity” in relation to height variations, it may be helpful for Council to consider Performance Criterion 6.7.1 P1 of the RDC, which contemplates the following:

- *Adequate direct sun to buildings and appurtenant open spaces;*
- *Adequate daylight to major openings to habitable rooms; and*
- *Access to views of significance.*

As demonstrated in the shadow diagram, the percentage of shadowfall on the neighbouring lot is well within the 35% allowable under the RDC for areas with a density coding of R30. The provision of direct sun to the habitable rooms and appurtenant open spaces of affected buildings therefore remains satisfactory.

Similarly, the large quantity of site proposed to remain free of development ensures that access to views of significance have been preserved, especially for the southern neighbours.

It should be remarked that there already exists a substantial dwelling on this prominent lot. The proposed dwelling is well-matched to the steep, relatively high-profile site and at any rate is in keeping with mix of building sizes that are found in south Cottesloe generally. The degree of cut proposed is such that when seen from Avonmore Terrace, the dwelling would appear little more than a single storey building.

One written objection to the overheight nature of the proposal has been received from the owner of 1/9 Princes Street. [Applicant’s response forthcoming]

In the light of the above, the variation may be considered allowable under Clauses 5.1.1 (a) and (c) of TPS2.

ASSESSMENT BASED ON HYPOTHETICAL FUTURE SUBDIVISION

Should Council feel that the above rationale is unsatisfactory, there is another approach to the height variation that can be considered.

An application for subdivision of the lot has been lodged with the Western Australian Planning Commission (WAPC). As it is likely that the lot will be subdivided in the future, it would be prudent considering planning matters such as open space, setbacks and building height as though the subdivision had already occurred.

The proposed subdivision is compliant with WAPC policy and approval to subdivide is considered likely. Nevertheless, the owners wish to avoid subdivision if possible as a new lot west of the proposed dwelling would attract significant annual land taxes.

Four-corner averaging for the hypothetical eastern lot marked on the plans dated 24 February 2010 generates an NGL of 25.96m. The geographical centre of the hypothetical eastern lot is approximately 26.7m but as the site has been extensively terraced it would be more feasible to propose NGL that is closer to the four corner average figure of 25.96m. On this basis, the NGL of 26.0m that is assumed by the applicant appears reasonable and has been used for the calculations below.

Based on this NGL, the wall height of the proposed dwelling would be within the maximum prescribed by Clause 5.1.1 (c) of TPS2. The main ridge height would also be within the level of maximum height, with the maximum height of the pyramidal loggia roof being 0.2m overheight. Such a lot configuration would see the undercroft comply at approximately 0.4m below the requirements of Clause 5.1.1 (a) of TPS2.

It would then only remain to assess the impact of the pyramidal roof on the amenity of surrounding areas. As TPS2 does not provide a detailed framework for the assessment of minor projections, Council has traditionally made use of Performance Criterion 6.7.1 P1 of the RDC, which contemplates:

Building height consistent with the desired height of buildings in the locality, and to recognize the need to protect the amenities of adjoining properties, including, where appropriate:

- *Adequate direct sun to buildings and appurtenant open spaces;*
- *Adequate daylight to major openings to habitable rooms; and*
- *Access to views of significance.*

It should be noted that the roof is pyramidal and therefore proposed to be overheight at one particular point only, rather than along a section of ridge. Furthermore, the roof-point does not exceed a height of 200mm above the maximum level.

The pyramidal roof would thus be unlikely to have a significant adverse impact on the amenities of adjoining properties as it would not compromise the provision of direct sun to any building, including its habitable rooms and appurtenant open spaces.

One written objection to the over height nature of the proposal has been received from the owner of 1/9 Princes Street. However it should be noted that the submitter responded to the plans dated 24 February 2010, which proposed a variation of

700mm rather than the 200mm that is presently proposed. Moreover, as the pyramidal roof would likely have little effect on the view lines of the submitter, the objection could be classified as one made in principle rather than due to adverse effect on amenity.

It is therefore apparent that if the proposal were assessed as though the eastern lot existed, the pyramidal roof would meet the relevant Performance Criterion and be allowable.

Front Setback

SETBACK REQUIREMENTS FOR EXISTING LOT

It is intended to change the primary street frontage of the property from Avonmore Terrace to Princes Street. The setback requirements from Avonmore Terrace and Princes Street would therefore change to 1.5m and 6.0m respectively.

A setback of 4.522m from Princes Street to the dwelling is proposed. The reduced setback would occur for approximately 7.7m or 17% of the 45.26m Princes Street frontage. (It should be noted that if the parent lot were subdivided as discussed, the reduced setback frontage would be 28.5%).

The proposal satisfies the 4.0m Acceptable Development Standard of the RDC for areas with density codes of R30 but by resolution Council prefers 6.0m setbacks. By resolution Council also prefers not to encourage the setback averaging allowed under the RDC.

Notwithstanding, the applicant has submitted the following justification for the proposed reduced setback:

- There are similar examples of reduced setbacks that occur along Princes Street notably to the first three dwellings along the same street elevation, back from the corner of Marine Parade;
- The frontage of the proposed design is staggered, presenting less mass to the street.

On balance, the applicant's justification appears supportable. Several buildings further west along Princes Street have approved reduced setbacks - 3.5m for 1A Princes Street, 3.97m for 1/3 Princes Street and 2.7m for 1 Princes. In addition, the lower half of the site is proposed to remain free of development for some time, with the result being that only 17% of the frontage would contain a dwelling built forward of the 6.0m setback line.

One written objection to the proposed reduced front setback has been received from the owner of 1/9 Princes Street. The submitter has expressed concern about the reduction in ocean views that would follow allowing the setback variation.

The applicant has responded by pointing out that the development would actually improve views from the affected property by virtue of eliminating the tree and overheight walls that surround the site. It is further demonstrated by the applicant that were the lot developed to the full potential of the 6.0m setback requirement, the

view lines from the affected property would actually be substantially more impacted (refer attached diagram).

Lastly, it should be noted that the section of dwelling that encroaches into the setback area does not appear to be visible from the affected property (refer attached diagram).

Thus, whilst an objection to the proposed reduced setback has been received, the applicant has sufficiently demonstrated that the amenity of neighbouring areas is not unduly affected.

In general, the proposed reduced setback is expected to function relatively well in the context of the streetscape and can be allowed.

Other variations

Minor variations are proposed to RDC Acceptable Development Standards that relate to privacy and side setbacks. No written objections were received in relation to these variations. All variations meet the relevant Performance Criteria and may be supported.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the proposed dwelling seeks concessions to building height that are assessed as justified given the steep topography of the site and being unlikely to negatively impact amenity of neighbouring properties. It is also noted that technically the height variation would be negligible in the event of the lot being subdivided.

The proposed reduced front setback complies with the Acceptable Development Standards of the RDC and could be expected to perform well in its context.

All other aspects of the proposal satisfy the requirements of the RDC.

Approval is recommended.

VOTING

Simple Majority

COMMITTEE COMMENT

Committee discussed the proposal at length including with officers and the architect. Both the habitability and height of the undercroft were queried. Mr Jackson explained the Scheme provisions, which do not allow for habitable rooms or height variation, and how the design could be amended to suit. Committee saw fit to strengthen condition (m) to cover these two aspects.

The front setback was also queried, in relation to whether the R30 standard of 4m could be allowed (with which the proposal complies) or Council's preference of the R20 standard of 6m should be applied, having regard to the larger lot accommodating a large proposed dwelling rather than smaller lots. It was observed

that the design of the dwelling addressing the site to create internal as well as open spaces seeks the lesser setback, and at the same time that recent examples of reduced setbacks in South Cottesloe are either subdivided smaller lots or strata subdivisions. Overall, Committee did not move to amend the setback.

Committee felt that the maximum building height warranted careful consideration and that the variation of over one metre was significant. It was suggested that plans comparing profiles of the existing dwelling, proposed dwelling and Scheme height standard would assist. Mr Jackson, aided by Mr Schaefer, explained the design in terms of the extent and position of the additional height and assessment of its implications. Mr Jackson elaborated on the decision-making approach to the exercise of discretion generally. He observed that in the past Council has supported height variations of about half a metre as acceptable (ie in terms of being discernable, controlling building bulk/scale, managing amenity and protecting streetscapes). With this proposal a main roof ridge and the pyramidal roof are the highest portions of the dwelling in excess of the 8.5m standard, which might be modified in design to be lower. On balance, Committee concluded that a new condition (n) be included to require a reduced maximum building height (ie lesser variation) of 9m relative to the NGL figure.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION

That Council:

1. GRANT its Approval to Commence Development for the proposed two storey dwelling with undercroft and swimming pool on Lot 37 (No 7) Avonmore Terrace, Cottesloe, in accordance with the revised plans submitted on 21 April 2010, subject to the following conditions:
 - (a) All construction work shall be carried out in accordance with the Environmental Protection (Noise) Regulations 1997, Regulation 13 - Construction Sites.
 - (b) Stormwater runoff from the driveway or any other paved portion of the site shall not be discharged onto the street reserve or adjoining properties, and the gutters and downpipes used for the disposal of stormwater runoff from roofed areas shall be included within the working drawings for a building licence.
 - (c) The external profile of the development as shown on the approved plans shall not be changed, whether by the addition of any service plant, fitting, fixture or otherwise, except with the written consent of Council.
 - (d) Air-conditioning plant and equipment shall be located closer to the proposed dwelling than the adjoining dwellings, and suitably housed or treated as may be necessary, so as to ensure that sound levels emitted shall not exceed those outlined in the Environmental Protection (Noise) Regulations 1997.
 - (e) Any fencing and gating to the site within the front setback area shall be of an open-aspect design in accordance with Council's Fencing Local Law, and full details shall be shown on the Building Licence plans.
 - (f) The property owner shall liaise with Council's Rates Department to formally change the street address of the property to a Princes Street address prior to completion of the development.
 - (g) The spa/pool pump and filter shall be located closer to the proposed dwelling than the adjoining dwellings and housed or treated to ensure that noise

- emissions do not exceed the levels prescribed by the Environmental Protection (Noise) Regulations 1997.
- (h) Wastewater or backwash water from swimming pool filtration systems shall be disposed of into adequate soakwells and contained within the boundary of the property.
 - (i) A soakwell system having a minimum capacity of 763 litres and located a minimum of 1.8metres away from any building or boundary shall be installed to the satisfaction of the Environmental Health Officer.
 - (j) Wastewater or backwash water shall not be disposed of into the Council's street drainage system or the Water Corporation's sewer.
 - (k) As part of the Building Licence Application a comprehensive construction management plan shall be submitted to the satisfaction of the Manager Development Services.
 - (l) A comprehensive photographic survey of the interior and exterior of the place shall be submitted for heritage records prior to the issue of a Demolition Licence.
 - (m) The design of the undercroft as part of the overall dwelling shall be amended to ensure compliance with the height requirements of the Scheme, that is, to not exceed the natural ground level measured at the centre of the site as determined by Council, being 25.15m, and the details of this shall be shown in the plans submitted for a Building Licence, to the satisfaction of the Manager Development Services. The applicant should liaise with the Town's Planning staff accordingly.

Advice Notes:

- (i) Given the concerns of neighbours, it is recommended that dilapidation reports be prepared for the properties to the south as part of the Building Licence process.
 - (ii) The applicant/owner is responsible for ensuring that all lot boundaries shown on the approved plans are correct and that the proposed development occurs entirely within the owner's property.
2. Advise the submitters of the decision.

AMENDMENT

Moved Cr Dawkins, seconded Cr Birnbrauer

That the following be added to condition (m), to ensure that the undercroft is not used for habitable purposes: "In order to comply with Town Planning Scheme No. 2, the undercroft shall not be designed or used for habitable purposes, in accordance with clause 5.1.1(a). Detailed revised plans demonstrating compliance with this requirement shall be submitted for approval at Building Licence stage, to the satisfaction of the Manager Development Services."

Carried 7/0

AMENDMENT

Moved Cr Birnbrauer, seconded Cr Strzina

That the following condition (n) be added: "The design of the dwelling shall be modified to ensure that the maximum building (ie roof) height does not exceed 9.0m relative to the natural ground level determined by Council of 25.15m. Detailed revised plans demonstrating compliance with this requirement shall be submitted for approval at Building Licence stage, to the satisfaction of the Manager Development Services."

Carried 5/2

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

Moved Cr Strzina, seconded Cr Goldthorpe

That Council:

1. **GRANT its Approval to Commence Development for the proposed two storey dwelling with undercroft and swimming pool on Lot 37 (No 7) Avonmore Terrace, Cottesloe, in accordance with the revised plans submitted on 21 April 2010, subject to the following conditions:**
 - (a) **All construction work shall be carried out in accordance with the Environmental Protection (Noise) Regulations 1997, Regulation 13 - Construction Sites.**
 - (b) **Stormwater runoff from the driveway or any other paved portion of the site shall not be discharged onto the street reserve or adjoining properties, and the gutters and downpipes used for the disposal of stormwater runoff from roofed areas shall be included within the working drawings for a building licence.**
 - (c) **The external profile of the development as shown on the approved plans shall not be changed, whether by the addition of any service plant, fitting, fixture or otherwise, except with the written consent of Council.**
 - (d) **Air-conditioning plant and equipment shall be located closer to the proposed dwelling than the adjoining dwellings, and suitably housed or treated as may be necessary, so as to ensure that sound levels emitted shall not exceed those outlined in the Environmental Protection (Noise) Regulations 1997.**
 - (e) **Any fencing and gating to the site within the front setback area shall be of an open-aspect design in accordance with Council's Fencing Local Law, and full details shall be shown on the Building Licence plans.**
 - (f) **The property owner shall liaise with Council's Rates Department to formally change the street address of the property to a Princes Street address prior to completion of the development.**
 - (g) **The spa/pool pump and filter shall be located closer to the proposed dwelling than the adjoining dwellings and housed or treated to ensure that noise emissions do not exceed the levels prescribed by the Environmental Protection (Noise) Regulations 1997.**

- (h) Wastewater or backwash water from swimming pool filtration systems shall be disposed of into adequate soakwells and contained within the boundary of the property.
- (i) A soakwell system having a minimum capacity of 763 litres and located a minimum of 1.8metres away from any building or boundary shall be installed to the satisfaction of the Environmental Health Officer.
- (j) Wastewater or backwash water shall not be disposed of into the Council's street drainage system or the Water Corporation's sewer.
- (k) As part of the Building Licence Application a comprehensive construction management plan shall be submitted to the satisfaction of the Manager Development Services.
- (l) A comprehensive photographic survey of the interior and exterior of the place shall be submitted for heritage records prior to the issue of a Demolition Licence.
- (m) The design of the undercroft as part of the overall dwelling shall be amended to ensure compliance with the height requirements of the Scheme, that is, to not exceed the natural ground level measured at the centre of the site as determined by Council, being 25.15m, and the details of this shall be shown in the plans submitted for a building licence, to the satisfaction of the Manager Development Services. The applicant should liaise with the Town's Planning staff accordingly. In order to comply with Town Planning Scheme No. 2, the undercroft shall not be designed or used for habitable purposes, in accordance with clause 5.1.1(a). Detailed revised plans demonstrating compliance with this requirement shall be submitted for approval at Building Licence stage, to the satisfaction of the Manager Development Services.
- (n) The design of the dwelling shall be modified to ensure that the maximum building (ie roof) height does not exceed 9.0m relative to the natural ground level determined by Council of 25.15m. Detailed revised plans demonstrating compliance with this requirement shall be submitted for approval at Building Licence stage, to the satisfaction of the Manager Development Services.

Advice Notes:

- (i) Given the concerns of neighbours, it is recommended that dilapidation reports be prepared for the properties to the south as part of the Building Licence process.
- (ii) The applicant/owner is responsible for ensuring that all lot boundaries shown on the approved plans are correct and that the proposed development occurs entirely within the owner's property.

2. Advise the submitters of the decision.

The Substantive Motion was put:

Carried 6/1

10.1.3 10 GRANT STREET – TWO-STOREY DWELLING WITH ROOF-DECK, UNDERCROFT AND POOL

File No:	1916
Attachments:	10 Grant St Part 1.pdf 10 Grant St Part 2.pdf
Responsible Officer:	Carl Askew Chief Executive Officer
Author:	Ed Drewett Senior Planning Officer
Proposed Meeting Date:	17 May 2010
Author Disclosure of Interest	Nil
Property Owner	PSR Jackson & Holihox Pty Ltd
Applicant	Hartree and Associates Architects
Date of Application	16 March 2010
Zoning:	Residential
Use:	P - A use that is permitted under this Scheme
Lot Area:	443m²

SUMMARY

This application is seeking the following variations to Council's Town Planning Scheme No. 2 and the Residential Design Codes:

- Building height;
- Visual privacy

Both of these issues are discussed in this report. The proposed development complies with the Scheme and Residential Design Codes in all other respects.

Given the assessment that has been undertaken, the recommendation is to conditionally approve the application.

PROPOSAL

This application is for the demolition of the existing dwelling and construction of a two-storey dwelling with a roof-deck, undercroft and pool.

The proposed dwelling is of contemporary design comprising a north-facing living room, study, main courtyard and pool on the ground floor and 3 bedrooms, bathrooms and a sitting area above. A roof-deck is also proposed within the south-eastern portion of the roof which is accessible from the upper-level sitting area. Photovoltaic cells will be concealed within the roof area.

STATUTORY ENVIRONMENT

- Town of Cottesloe Town Planning Scheme No 2
- Residential Design Codes

PROPOSED LOCAL PLANNING SCHEME NO. 3:

No changes are proposed to the zoning of this lot.

APPLICATION ASSESSMENT**AREAS OF NON-COMPLIANCE****Town Planning Scheme No. 2**

Policy	Required	Provided
Height	6m wall height; 8.5m roof height (where pitched)	7.5m above the determined natural ground level (flat roof design)

Residential Design Codes

Design Element	Acceptable Standards	Provided	Performance Criteria Clause
6.8 – Privacy requirements	4.5m cone of vision to bedrooms; 7.5m cone of vision from accessible rooftop and raised courtyard	Distances from western boundary: 2.8m & 3.4m from bedrooms; 5.8m from roof-deck; 4m from raised rear courtyard	Clause 6.8.1 – P1
6.7 – Building height	7m to top of external wall (concealed roof)	7.5m	Clause 6.7.1 – P1

ADVERTISING OF PROPOSAL

The application was advertised in accordance with TPS 2. The advertising consisted of a letter to three neighbouring properties, including on the opposite (eastern) side of the Margaret Street. Three submissions were received.

Susan Cann & Peter Landau, 8 Grant Street (submitted by applicant)

- Supports the application with the variations sought to the wall height;

Carlo Del Corso, 12 & 14 Grant Street

- The proximity of the proposed dwelling to our 1st floor living area window and verandah would substantially affect our sea view but appears unavoidable as it is compliant with the Codes;
- The new dwelling should not exceed 7 metres, to reduce the impact of the eastern side of the new building which stands directly in front of our verandah and living room windows;
- The roof deck will overlook our property and, if covered or screened, it will appear 3 storeys.

Joe Zito, 2 Margaret Street

- Had no success in obtaining copy of plans from applicant and therefore expresses concern to additional height above normal height restrictions;
- Reserves decision to support the proposal until plans have been made available by applicant showing any overlapping of the current building height.

MUNICIPAL INVENTORY

The existing dwelling is not on the Town's Municipal Inventory.

APPLICANT'S JUSTIFICATION

The applicant has submitted a detailed submission in support of the proposal. A model has also been provided.

A summary of the main points relevant to the variations sought are as follows:

- The natural ground level (NGL) of the lot is 1.1m below Grant Street and between 1.5m and 0.25m below Margaret Street;
- The amount of additional height sought is generally less than the amount by which the site is lower than the adjoining streets and therefore is not excessive;
- The apparent height of the building above the centreline of Margaret Street ranges from 5.97m at the south to 6.92m at the North. The apparent height of the building above the centreline of the northern lane of Grant Street ranges from 6.17m at the east to 6.64m at the west. The proposed dwelling will be even less prominent when viewed from the intersection of Margaret and Grant Street and would have no negative impact on the streetscape or have any adverse impact on neighbouring properties;
- The existing buildings at 4 & 6 Grant Street have an apparent height greater than that proposed;
- The open space which surrounds the building on three of its four sides will serve to disguise the proposed additional 0.5m wall height, ensuring that no variation to the existing street pattern is present;
- The house does not create any overshadowing of winter sun to adjoining properties;
- Due to topography, the house to the east has an NGL more than 3m higher than that of the subject lot and so the proposed additional 0.5m height will not obstruct coastal views. This is particularly the case when considering the taller, pitched roof form of houses on Grant Street west of the lot;
- Two upper level major openings, from the north secondary bedroom and south secondary bedroom, create minor overlooking incursions across the western

boundary. However, the NGL for 8 Grant Street is 1.41m below that of 10 Grant Street and the difference in finished floor levels of the upper floors is 2.35m. Therefore, the south facing bedroom primarily overlooks the neighbour's roof and the north facing bedroom is prevented from overlooking by a boundary fence. Both therefore will not adversely impact on privacy or amenity.

APPLICANT'S RESPONSE TO NEIGHBOUR'S OBJECTIONS

The main points raised by the applicant in response to the comments received are summarised below:

- The living room and verandah of the neighbour's property at 12 & 14 Grant Street is over 45m away so it would be difficult for the proposed additional 0.5m wall height to have any discernable negative impact on the occupants;
- Due to the topography of the area, the sites along Grant Street to the west of No. 10 are higher and therefore have a greater impact on sight lines than the proposed development (refer drawing SK05-rev 5);
- The ground floor level of the eastern neighbour's property is higher than the upper floor level of the proposed house thereby reducing any visual impact;
- A compliant development on the site with a pitched roof would have a greater visual impact on the neighbour's property than the proposed flat roof;
- The proposed roof deck complies with the privacy requirements of the Residential Design Codes and is well separated from the eastern neighbour's property so will not create unreasonable privacy concerns.

PLANNING COMMENT

Two variations are being sought by the applicant to Council's Town Planning Scheme No. 2 and the Residential Design Codes. These are both discussed below:

Building Height

The calculation of building height stems from Council's determination of natural ground levels (NGL). Clause 5.1.1 of the Council's Town Planning Scheme No.2 expresses policy in relation to building height and paragraph (c) of that clause provides a basic formula in relation to measurement of such height.

The Scheme does not specifically address flat or concealed roof designs and so it has been Council practice to use the Residential Design Codes as the basis for determining building heights for this form of development. Privacy, views and general amenity also are relevant factors to be considered under the Scheme.

The Town has determined the natural ground level (NGL) at the centre of the lot to be RL:10.3 based on an average of the four corners. It is difficult to determine an exact NGL at the centre of the lot due the presence of an existing dwelling but recent

calculations by the Town of average ground levels on adjoining lots reaffirms this figure.

The maximum permitted wall height under the acceptable development standards of the RDC for a concealed or flat roof is RL: 17.3 (7 metres) for this lot. The proposed development has a wall height of RL: 17.8 (7.5m) and therefore does not meet this standard but may be supported under performance criteria.

The relevant performance criteria (Clause 6.7.1) states:

Building height consistent with the desired height of buildings in the locality, and to recognise the need to protect the amenities of adjoining properties, including, where appropriate:

- *adequate direct sun to buildings and appurtenant open spaces;*
- *adequate daylight to major openings to habitable rooms; and*
- *access to views of significance.*

There is a variety of housing types in the area including single-storey and two-storey dwellings as well as older-style flats (multiple dwellings) and height concessions have previously been approved by Council for new developments in the locality (eg: 191 Broome Street, on the corner of Grant Street - approved with roof projections to height of 7.6m above a concealed roof). The adjoining dwelling to the north of the lot at 1 Margaret Street also has a current approval for a proposed two-storey dwelling with a concealed flat roof and undercoft, albeit being compliant with the Codes in terms of its building height.

The actual roof height of the proposed dwelling will be only 6.5m above the average natural ground level. The proposed additional 1m wall height enables a solid balustrade to be constructed around the roof-deck and solar panels and is required under the Building Regulations. Although the balustrade could be of an open-aspect design (ie; have a railing around it or glass) to reduce its visual impact this would not necessarily suit the contemporary design of the building, it may further reduce privacy for the occupants, and it is unlikely to make a significant difference to the building bulk.

The topography of the land surrounding the site also warrants special consideration as the lot is less elevated than the adjoining street level so the overall building height will appear below 7 metres when viewed from Margaret Street and Grant Street (refer: Drawing SK05-rev. 4 for detail). Furthermore, the ground floor level of the proposed dwelling will be 1.6m lower than the ground floor in the existing dwelling so is more consistent with natural levels on the lot and probably less intrusive.

The location of the lot on the northern side of Grant Street ensures that adequate direct sun and daylight will be maintained to adjoining dwellings despite the proposed increased height as overshadowing will be predominantly restricted to the road reserve.

Views of significance will not be significantly affected by the proposal as the adjoining properties on the east side of Margaret Street are two-storey, separated by a reasonable distance and are elevated above road level. Furthermore, if the proposed development had a pitched roof it would be permitted under the Scheme and would

extend 1m higher than that proposed (to 8.5m) thereby having a greater impact on views than that proposed (refer: Drawing SKO5-rev 5 for detail). The proposed 6m front setback to the new dwelling should ensure that a view corridor still exists from 12/14 Grant Street westwards.

In summary, the 0.5m height variation sought would be unlikely to have a significant adverse visual impact on the streetscape or the amenity of adjoining neighbours and the proposal can be supported under performance criteria of the Residential Design Codes.

Visual Privacy

The proposed development complies with the majority of visual privacy requirements of the Residential Design Codes as most windows and outdoor living areas will overlook the adjoining streets or the right of way at the rear of the lot. However, the proposed rear upper floor bedroom windows, rear courtyard and the roof deck do not meet the acceptable development standards of the Codes in relation to the western boundary and therefore need to be assessed under performance criteria.

The relevant performance criteria (Clause 6.8.1) states:

Direct overlooking of active habitable spaces and outdoor living areas of other dwellings is minimised by building layout, location and design of major openings and outdoor active habitable spaces, screening devices and landscape, or remoteness.

Effective location of major openings and outdoor active habitable spaces to avoid overlooking is preferred to the use of screening devices or obscured glass.

Where they are used, they should be integrated with the building design and have minimal impact on residents' or neighbours' amenity.

Where opposite windows are offset from the edge of another, the distance of the offset should be sufficient to limit views into adjacent windows.

Due to the existing differences in ground levels between 8 and 10 Grant Street the overlooking from the south-facing rear bedroom window and the proposed roof-deck will avoid active habitable spaces, major openings and outdoor living areas as the cone of vision will generally be over the adjoining roof. The proposed north-facing bedroom window could potentially overlook a section of the neighbour's outdoor living area but again due to the level differences and also the location of an existing high boundary wall along the common boundary and proposed operable batten solar screening on the rear elevation significant loss of privacy is unlikely to occur. The existing boundary wall and the location of the proposed driveway to the undercroft garage will also minimise any potential overlooking from the proposed raised courtyard area at the rear of the dwelling.

CONCLUSION

The proposed two-storey dwelling with undercroft, roof-deck and pool can be supported with the variations sought as it satisfies the performance criteria of the Residential Design Codes. Furthermore, while Council's discretion is sought in

regards to the height, it is assessed that issues such as privacy, views and general amenity have been satisfactorily addressed in this case.

VOTING

Simple Majority

COMMITTEE COMMENT

Committee indicated support for the proposal including the roof terrace as acceptable in the circumstances.

OFFICER & COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

Moved Cr Birnbrauer, seconded Cr Dawkins

That Council:

1. **GRANT its Approval to Commence Development for the proposed two-storey dwelling with roof-deck, undercroft and pool at No. 10 (Lot 56) Grant Street, Cottesloe, in accordance with the plans submitted on 12 & 28 April 2010, subject to the following conditions:**
 - (a) **All construction work shall be carried out in accordance with the Environmental Protection (Noise) Regulations 1997, Regulation 13 - Construction Sites.**
 - (b) **Stormwater runoff from the driveway or any other paved portion of the site shall not be discharged onto the street reserve, right of way or adjoining properties, and the gutters and downpipes used for the disposal of stormwater runoff from roofed areas shall be included within the working drawings for a building licence.**
 - (c) **The external profile of the development as shown on the approved plans shall not be changed, whether by the addition of any service plant, fitting, fixture or otherwise, except with the written consent of Council.**
 - (d) **The existing redundant crossover being removed and the verge, kerb and all surfaces made good at the applicant's expense to the satisfaction of the Manager Engineering Services.**
 - (e) **Air-conditioning plant and equipment shall be located closer to the proposed dwelling than the adjoining dwellings, and suitably housed or treated as may be necessary, so as to ensure that sound levels emitted shall not exceed those outlined in the Environmental Protection (Noise) Regulations 1997.**
 - (f) **Any fencing to the site within the front setback area shall be of an open- aspect design in accordance with Council's Fencing Local Law.**
 - (g) **The pool pump and filter shall be located so as not to impact on adjoining properties and suitably housed or treated as may be necessary so as to ensure that environmental nuisance due to noise or vibration from mechanical equipment is satisfactorily**

minimised to within permissible levels outlined in the Environmental Protection (Noise) Regulations 1997.

- (h) Wastewater or backwash from pool filtration systems shall be contained within the boundary of the property and disposed of into adequate soakwells.
 - (i) A soakwell system shall be installed to the satisfaction of the Environmental Health Officer, having a minimum capacity of 763 litres and located a minimum 1.8 metres away from any building or boundary.
 - (j) Wastewater or backwash shall not be disposed of into the Council's street drainage system or the Water Corporation's sewer.
 - (k) The right-of-way located at the rear of the lot being paved and drained and/or upgraded to the satisfaction of the Manager of Engineering Services with details of the proposed works being submitted in accordance with Council guidelines and approved prior to the commencement of works.
2. Advise the submitters of its decision.

Carried 7/0

11 ELECTED MEMBERS' MOTIONS OF WHICH PREVIOUS NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN

Nil

12 NEW BUSINESS OF AN URGENT NATURE INTRODUCED BY ELECTED MEMBERS/OFFICERS BY DECISION OF MEETING

Mr Jackson briefly updated Committee regarding some current proposals and progress of the planning reforms being implemented by the State Government.

Mr Jackson also took the opportunity to farewell the present Development Services Secretary, Ms Pauline Dyer, and thanked Pauline for her service to Committee and contribution the Planning Team and Town of Cottesloe.

13 MEETING CLOSURE

The Presiding Member announced the closure of the meeting at 7:25 PM.

CONFIRMED: PRESIDING MEMBER _____ *DATE: .../.../...*