

TOWN OF COTTESLOE



DEVELOPMENT SERVICES COMMITTEE MINUTES

MAYOR'S PARLOUR, COTTESLOE CIVIC CENTRE
109 BROOME STREET, COTTESLOE
6.00 PM, MONDAY, 16 JUNE 2014

CARL ASKEW
Chief Executive Officer

18 June 2014

DISCLAIMER

No responsibility whatsoever is implied or accepted by the Town for any act, omission, statement or intimation occurring during council meetings.

The Town of Cottesloe disclaims any liability for any loss whatsoever and howsoever caused arising out of reliance by any person or legal entity on any such act, omission, statement or intimation occurring during council meetings.

Any person or legal entity who acts or fails to act in reliance upon any statement, act or omission made in a council meeting does so at that person's or legal entity's own risk.

In particular and without derogating in any way from the broad disclaimer above, in any discussion regarding any planning application or application for a licence, any statement or intimation of approval made by any member or officer of the Town of Cottesloe during the course of any meeting is not intended to be and is not taken as notice of approval from the Town.

The Town of Cottesloe wishes to advise that any plans or documents contained within the agenda or minutes may be subject to copyright law provisions (*Copyright Act 1968*, as amended) and that the express permission of the copyright owner(s) should be sought prior to their reproduction.

Members of the public should note that no action should be taken on any application or item discussed at a council meeting prior to written advice on the resolution of council being received.

Agenda and minutes are available on the Town's website www.cottesloe.wa.gov.au

DEVELOPMENT SERVICES COMMITTEE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ITEM	SUBJECT	PAGE NO
1	DECLARATION OF MEETING OPENING/ANNOUNCEMENT OF VISITORS.....	3
2	DISCLAIMER	3
3	ANNOUNCEMENTS BY PRESIDING MEMBER WITHOUT DISCUSSION	3
4	PUBLIC QUESTION TIME	3
	4.1 RESPONSE TO PREVIOUS PUBLIC QUESTIONS TAKEN ON NOTICE.....	3
	4.2 PUBLIC QUESTIONS	3
5	PUBLIC STATEMENT TIME.....	3
6	ATTENDANCE	4
	6.1 APOLOGIES	4
	6.2 APPROVED LEAVE OF ABSENCE	4
	6.3 APPLICATIONS FOR LEAVE OF ABSENCE	4
7	DECLARATION OF INTERESTS.....	4
8	CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES.....	5
9	PRESENTATIONS	5
	9.1 PETITIONS.....	5
	9.2 PRESENTATIONS	5
	9.3 DEPUTATIONS	5
10	REPORTS	6
	10.1 PLANNING	6
	10.1.1 NO. 204 (LOT 22) MARINE PARADE - ADDITIONS AND ALTERATIONS TO THE FRONT AND SIDE OF AN EXISTING TWO STOREY DWELLING	6
	10.1.2 NOS. 236-242 (LOTS 4, 5, 6 & 800) MARINE PARADE & 61 (LOT 801) MARGARET STREET - SINGLE DWELLING WITH BELOW-GROUND GARAGE/CELLAR AND POOL	11
	10.1.3 NO. 19 PERTH STREET - PROPOSED DEMOLITION OF DWELLING	22

11 ELECTED MEMBERS' MOTIONS OF WHICH PREVIOUS NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN 33

12 NEW BUSINESS OF AN URGENT NATURE INTRODUCED BY DECISION OF MEETING BY: 33

 12.1 ELECTED MEMBERS..... 33

 12.2 OFFICERS 33

13 MEETING CLOSED TO PUBLIC 33

 13.1 MATTERS FOR WHICH THE MEETING MAY BE CLOSED 33

 13.2 PUBLIC READING OF RECOMMENDATIONS THAT MAY BE MADE PUBLIC 33

14 MEETING CLOSURE..... 33

1 DECLARATION OF MEETING OPENING/ANNOUNCEMENT OF VISITORS

The Presiding Member announced the meeting opened at 6:03 PM.

2 DISCLAIMER

The Presiding Member drew attention to the Town's disclaimer.

3 ANNOUNCEMENTS BY PRESIDING MEMBER WITHOUT DISCUSSION

Nil.

4 PUBLIC QUESTION TIME**4.1 RESPONSE TO PREVIOUS PUBLIC QUESTIONS TAKEN ON NOTICE**

Nil.

4.2 PUBLIC QUESTIONS

Nil.

5 PUBLIC STATEMENT TIME

Mr Peter Rattigan, 9 Grant Street, Cottesloe – Re North Cottesloe Surf Life Saving Club Liquor Licence Application

This was a general matter raised, not part of the Agenda. Mr Rattigan expressed concern about noise from Club functions since the premises were extended, which had been intrusive from his nearby property. He suggested that the liquor licence should be conditional upon management measures to address noise (eg Council approval for amplified music) and events to ameliorate potential impacts.

Mr David Read, The Planning Group Pty Ltd, for Item 10.1.2 – 236-242 Marine Parade & 61 Margaret Street – Single Dwelling with Below Ground Garage/Cellar and Pool

Mr Read withdrew his application to speak, handing-over to the applicant's architect, Mr David Hartree.

Mr David Hartree, Hartree and Associates, for Item 10.1.2 – 236-242 Marine Parade & 61 Margaret Street – Single Dwelling with Below Ground Garage/Cellar and Pool

Mr Hartree outlined the background to the present proposal and the latest design objectives. Whilst pleased with the basic recommendation of approval he still advocated the design approach being pursued despite the acknowledged planning compliance aspects set out in the assessment report by officers. He displayed and described plans illustrating the nature and

extent of site plus the previous and current designs, including the potential to modify the design if need be.

Mr Ian Wallace, 16 The Esplanade, Peppermint Grove – Re Item 10.1.3, 19 Perth Street

Mr Wallace, for his family as owners, expressed the opinion that heritage is subjective and that his consultants still stood by their assessment premised on relevant criteria and the changed streetscape. He also referred to the HCWA's advice that it did not intend to include the place in the State Heritage Register.

6 ATTENDANCE

Present

Cr Peter Jeanes	Presiding Member
Mayor Jo Dawkins	
Cr Philip Angers	
Cr Helen Burke	
Cr Jack Walsh	
Cr Katrina Downes	

Officers Present

Mr Carl Askew	Chief Executive Officer
Mr Andrew Jackson	Manager Development Services
Mr Ed Drewett	Senior Planning Officer
Mr Ronald Boswell	Planning Officer
Mrs Liz Yates	Development Services Administration Officer

6.1 APOLOGIES

Nil.

Officer Apologies

Nil.

6.2 APPROVED LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Nil.

6.3 APPLICATIONS FOR LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Nil.

7 DECLARATION OF INTERESTS

Mayor Dawkins declared an impartiality interest in Item 10.1.3, 19 Perth Street, due to being friends with the owners of the property and left the meeting at 6:50 PM for the duration of the item.

Cr Burke declared an impartiality interest in Item 10.1.3, 19 Perth Street. due to knowing the owners of the property and stated that as a consequence there may be a perception that her impartiality may be affected and declared that she would consider the matter on its merits and vote accordingly.

8 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

Moved Mayor Dawkins, seconded Cr Downes

[Minutes May 19 2014 Development Services Committee.docx](#)

The Minutes of the Ordinary meeting of the Development Services Committee, held on 19 May 2014 be confirmed.

Carried 6/0

9 PRESENTATIONS

9.1 PETITIONS

Nil.

9.2 PRESENTATIONS

Nil.

9.3 DEPUTATIONS

Nil.

For the benefit of the members of the public present, the Presiding Member determined to consider items 10.1.2 (204 Marine Parade) and 10.1.3 (19 Perth Street) first, and then return to the published order of the agenda.

10 REPORTS

10.1 PLANNING

10.1.1 NO. 204 (LOT 22) MARINE PARADE - ADDITIONS AND ALTERATIONS TO THE FRONT AND SIDE OF AN EXISTING TWO STOREY DWELLING

File Ref:	2909
Attachments:	204 Marine Pde Aerial 204 Marine Pde Plans 204 Marine Pde Property Photo Floor Plan 202 Marine
Responsible Officer:	Andrew Jackson Manager Development Services
Author:	Ronald Boswell Planning Officer
Proposed Meeting Date:	16 June 2014
Author Disclosure of Interest:	Nil
Property Owner	Richard & Mandy Pyvis
Applicant	Maurice Ford
Date of Application	15 April 2014
Zoning:	Residential R20
Use:	P - A use that is permitted under this Scheme
Lot Area:	364m²
M.R.S. Reservation:	Not applicable

SUMMARY

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

- Front setback
- Visual privacy

Each of these aspects is discussed in this report and refers to plans received on 15 April 2014.

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

PROPOSAL

This development application is for additions and alterations to the front and side of an existing two storey dwelling.

Additions:

- Double glazed windows to bedroom 1.
- WIR to bedroom 1.
- Ensuite to bedroom 1.

- Double entry doors to den and family room.
- Aluminium fence to sit on top of existing brick front boundary wall.
- Deck over side-rear courtyard with privacy screening.
- New entry door.
- Balcony at the front of the dwelling with privacy screening.
- Stackable doors to first floor living room.
- Window to front informal living room.

Alterations:

- Bedroom 1 in lieu of living room.
- Study/den in lieu of dining room.
- Replace family window with stackable sliding door.
- Kitchen remodelled.
- Bathroom renovated.
- Demolish existing walls in entry hall and kitchen.
- New first floor living area including kitchenette in lieu of bedroom 1/WIR and study.

STATUTORY ENVIRONMENT

- Town Planning Scheme No. 2
- Residential Design Codes

PROPOSED LOCAL PLANNING SCHEME NO. 3

R25 is proposed as the density coding of this lot.

APPLICATION ASSESMENT

Areas of non-compliance

Residential Design Codes

Design Element	Deemed-to-comply	Proposed	Design principles
5.4 Building design	7.5m cone of vision	2.8m, 5m	Clause 5.4.1 – P1.1 & P1.2

Council Policy/Resolution

Design Element	Permitted	Proposed
Streetscape	6m front setback (Council resolution 28/10/02).	4.5m to balcony.
Fencing	Open-aspect above 0.9m in front setback.	Solid letterbox at 1.5m long and 1.25m high.

ADVERTISING OF PROPOSAL

The application was advertised to adjoining owners in accordance with TPS2. No submissions were received during the advertising period.

PLANNING COMMENT

The following comments are made with respect to the proposed development:

Front setback

In 2002 Council resolved to generally require a 6m front setback for residential development which does not include averaging (for the preservation of streetscape, view corridors and amenity) regardless of the density coding.

The existing two storey dwelling protrudes forward of the 6m front setback and is setback 4.9m from the front boundary and the proposed balcony will be setback 4.5m from the front boundary. The applicant has increased the setback from the 4m originally proposed.

The dwelling adjoining 204 Marine Parade (No. 202 Marine Parade) received an approval by Council on 14 February 2012 for various concessions including a reduced setback for the balcony. Therefore the applicant has moved the balcony proposed for 204 Marine Parade to keep it in line with the newly built balcony at No. 202 Marine Parade.

The existing dwelling fits in with the pattern of reduced setbacks on the small lots along Marine Parade which has an open feel and looks to the ocean (ie with no development opposite). It also maintains the setback of the balcony that was recently constructed at No. 202 Marine Parade with Council approval and the design will compliment that dwelling.

The additions and alterations essentially revitalise the dwelling and maintain the streetscape arrangement with the dwellings either side. The overall degree of variation sought is relatively minor (whereas small lot dwelling designs can tend to seek quite significant variations), and does not affect neighbouring properties.

Visual privacy

The proposed first floor balcony to the front of the dwelling will have a 2.8m cone of vision to the northern boundary and a 5m cone of vision to the southern boundary, in lieu of 7.5m behind the front setback as required under the *deemed-to-comply* standards in the RDC. However, all overlooking is into the front setback areas and road reserve and does not pose any adverse affect on visual privacy for the neighbouring properties.

Fencing in front setback

A 1.5m wide x 1.25m high solid letterbox is proposed at the northern end of the western boundary wall (front fence).

This letterbox constitutes a variation to the Town's Fencing Local Law (FLL). Its length will only extend approximately 15% of the total length of the lot boundary with the remainder of the frontage having solid and open-aspect fencing that complies with the FLL. As such it is considered that this variation may be supported by Council as it is unlikely to have any significant adverse impact on the streetscape or neighbouring properties.

CONCLUSION

The proposed additions and alterations to the two storey dwelling can be supported as they represent acceptable variations under the RDC, Council's Resolution and the FLL. It satisfies the relevant performance criteria of the RDC and may be supported by Council. Furthermore, no submissions have been received from adjoining owners. The development is fully-compliant with the building height requirements of TPS2 and it is considered that the proposed addition will contribute to the prevailing streetscape.

COMMITTEE COMMENT

Committee was satisfied with the proposal and saw no need to discuss any detail.

VOTING

Simple Majority

OFFICER AND COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

Moved Cr Jeanes, seconded Cr Burke

THAT Council GRANT its approval to Commence Development for Additions and Alterations to the Front and Side of an Existing Two Storey Dwelling at 204 Marine Parade, Cottesloe, in accordance with the plans received on 15 April 2014 and the revised plans received on 15 May 2014, subject to the following conditions:

- 1. All construction work being carried out in accordance with the Environmental Protection (Noise) Regulations 1997, Regulation 13. – Construction sites.**
- 2. The external profile of the development as shown on the approved plans not being changed whether by the addition of any service plant, fitting, fixture or otherwise, except with the written consent of Council.**
- 3. All water draining from roofs and other impermeable surfaces shall be directed to garden areas, sumps or rainwater tanks within the development site where climatic and soil conditions allow for the effective retention of stormwater on-site.**
- 4. The roof surface being treated to reduce glare if Council considers that the glare adversely affects the amenity of adjoining or nearby neighbours following completion of the development.**
- 5. Air-conditioning plant and equipment shall be located closer to the dwelling than adjoining dwellings, and suitably housed or treated as may be necessary to ensure that sound levels do not exceed those specified in the Environment Protection (Noise) Regulations 1997.**

Advice Notes:

1. The owner/applicant is responsible for ensuring that all boundaries shown on the approved plans are correct and that the proposed development is constructed entirely with the owner's property.
2. The owner/applicant is responsible to apply to the Town for a Building Permit and to obtain approval prior to undertaking construction of the development.

Carried 6/0

**10.1.2 NOS. 236-242 (LOTS 4, 5, 6 & 800) MARINE PARADE & 61 (LOT 801)
MARGARET STREET - SINGLE DWELLING WITH BELOW-GROUND
GARAGE/CELLAR AND POOL**

File Ref: 2838 & 2841
Attachments: [236 242 Marine Pde Aerial](#)
[236 242 Marine Pde Submission](#)
[236 242 Marine Pde Property Photos](#)
[236 242 Marine Pde Plans](#)
[236 242 Marine Pde Pool Fencing](#)

Responsible Officer: Andrew Jackson
Manager Development Services

Author: Ed Drewett
Senior Planning Officer

Proposed Meeting Date: 16 June 2014

Author Disclosure of Interest: Nil

Property Owner: Stephen Tobin

Applicant: Hartree & Associates Architects

Date of Applications: 13 January 2014

Zoning: Residential R20

Use: P - A use that is permitted under this Scheme

Total Lot Area: 1877m² (following amalgamation)

M.R.S. Reservation: Not applicable

SUMMARY

Two planning applications have been submitted for this proposed development. One is for a proposed dwelling (DA 2841) and the other is for a swimming pool, fencing, retaining walls and landscaping (DA 2838).

These applications are seeking the following variations to Council's Scheme, Policies, Local Laws or the Residential Design Codes:

DA 2841

- Storeys
- Building height

DA 2838

- Front setback to pool
- Fencing

Each of these aspects is discussed in this report and refers to plans received on 19 May 2014.

Given the assessment that has been undertaken, the recommendation is to conditionally approve the application for the proposed dwelling subject to it not exceeding two storeys, and to conditionally approve the pool, retaining walls and landscaping.

PROPOSAL

The proposed dwelling is of contemporary design and comprises undercroft parking, a lower ground floor level, upper ground floor level, first floor level/terrace, and a pool. These are detailed as follows:

Basement level

- parking;
- store;
- cellar;
- lift;
- stairway;
- water tanks.

Lower ground floor level

- four bedrooms with ensuites;
- family room;
- store;
- laundry;
- lobby;
- lift;
- stairway/entry.

Upper ground level

- living room;
- kitchen/dining-room;
- rear terrace;
- library;
- lobby;
- lift;
- WC;
- stairway;
- courtyard area.

First floor/terrace

- bedroom with ensuite;
- walk-in robe;
- lobby;
- lift;
- terrace;
- covered stairway.

STATUTORY ENVIRONMENT

- Town Planning Scheme No. 2
- Residential Design Codes
- Fencing Local Law

PROPOSED LOCAL PLANNING SCHEME NO. 3

It is proposed to increase the density coding to R25 and to measure building heights between any point of natural ground level and the uppermost part of the building directly above that point.

HERITAGE LISTING

- N/A

APPLICATION ASSESSMENT**Areas of non-compliance****Town Planning Scheme No. 2**

	Permitted	Proposed
Storeys	Maximum 2 storeys, except that Council may permit a third storey to be located within the roof space and allow an undercroft space in accordance with TPS 2 clause 5.1.1.	3 storeys
Building height.	Max. wall height: 6m Max. flat roof height: 7m	Wall height: 7.05m (RL: 21.3) Flat roof height: 8.05m (RL: 22.3)

Council resolution/local law

	Permitted	Proposed
Streetscape	6m front setback (Council resolution 28/10/02).	5.4m to above-ground pool.
Fencing in front setback area.	0.9m unless open-aspect	0.9m - 1.1m along front boundary; 1.8m solid along southern elevation in front setback.

CONSULTATION

The application was advertised to 11 adjoining owners in accordance with TPS 2. No submissions have been received.

BACKGROUND

A history of applications on this site is as follows:

22 June 2009

Council approved a two-storey dwelling with undercroft and pool at 238-240 (Lots 4 & 5) Marine Parade (DA 1631). Expired 30 June 2011.

1 February 2010

The Town issued a Building Permit for earthworks on Lots 3 & 4. These works have been commenced.

1 June 2010

Amalgamation of Lots 4 and 5 approved by the WAPC. Expired 1 June 2013.

9 May 2011

Amalgamation of Lots 4, 5, 6, 800 & 801 approved by the WAPC. Expired 9 May 2014.

11 June 2011

Building Permit submitted for new dwelling. Not issued. Proposal pending further design.

13 January 2014

Current applications submitted.

Following an assessment of the current planning applications, the Town has been liaising extensively with the applicant and owner regarding maximum permitted storeys, building heights, front setbacks, fill/retaining walls and fencing. The Town subsequently received amended plans on 19 May 2014 which address some of the concerns raised but do not satisfy all of Council's requirements.

PLANNING ASSESSMENT

The following technical assessment is made with respect to variations sought under TPS 2 and Council requirements.

Storeys

The proposed development, including landscaping, fencing and pool, straddles five existing lots which are proposed to be amalgamated into one.

For the purposes of determining whether the proposed development exceeds the maximum two-storeys permitted under the Scheme, it has been necessary to determine the natural ground level (NGL) at the centre of the proposed amalgamated lots. This has been calculated at RL:14.25 using the corners of the site in accordance with Council Policy.

Clause 5.1.1(a) of TPS 2 advises:

Council's general policy for development within the district favours low rise development of no more than 2 storeys to maintain privacy, views and general amenity notwithstanding that Council may consider the circumstances and merits of each case in terms of amenity and development control provisions of this Scheme. In

exercising height control policies Council will not regard as a storey undercroft space designed and used for a lift shaft, stairway, meter room, bathroom, shower room, laundry, WC, other sanitary compartments, cellar, corridor, hallway, lobby, the parking of vehicles or any storeroom without windows or any workshop appurtenant to a car parking area where that space is not higher than 1m above the footpath level measured at the centre of the site along the boundary to which the space has frontage or where that space is below the NGL measured at the centre of the site as determined by Council.

Schedule 2 of TPS 2 provides the following definitions:

Storey: means that portion of a building which is situated between the top of any floor and the top of the floor next above, or if there is no floor above it, that portion between the top of the floor and the ceiling above it.

Building: Any structure whether fixed or moveable, temporary or permanent, placed or erected on land, and the term includes dwellings and structures appurtenant to dwellings such as carports, garages, verandahs, patios, outbuildings and retaining walls, but excludes boundary fences, pergolas and swimming pools (as stated in the RDC).

The proposed basement level constitutes an undercroft as it satisfies TPS 2 Clause 5.1.1(a). However, the proposed lower ground level constitutes a separate storey as the top of the floor level next above is 1.479m higher than that required under Clause 5.1.1(a) assuming the NGL at the centre of the lot is taken as the reference point. The alternative method of determining whether a space is considered a storey, by assuming a 1m height above the footpath level at the centre of the site along the boundary to which the space has frontage, does not help in this situation as the only visible street frontage of the lower ground floor is to Marine Parade which would provide a lower reference point than the centre NGL calculation. Furthermore, Margaret Street cannot be used as a reference point as the proposed lower ground floor space does not have frontage to that street.

The proposed lower ground floor also contains habitable rooms so even if the floor above it was lowered to below RL:14.25, only the proposed store, plant room, lift, stairs, laundry, bathrooms and entrance could be excluded from being counted as a storey. Therefore, the proposed covered stairway to the first level/terrace would have to be deleted to avoid this part of the dwelling being three-storeys, as the covered stairway is not excluded from the definition of a building. Furthermore, the covered stairway on the roof terrace could not be considered as being within the roof space of the dwelling as although the overall roof height is below 8.5m as required, the proposed wall heights (including the balustrades) are 6.25m (RL: 20.5) above NGL, which exceeds the maximum 6m wall height permitted under TPS 2 clause 5.1.1(b)(ii):

Council may permit a third storey to be located within the roof space of a dwelling provided that the development complies with the maximum wall and roof height provisions stipulated at paragraph(c) of this clause and also provided that, in Council's opinion, the dwelling will retain the appearance of a two-storey dwelling and will not adversely affect local amenity.

Council does not have discretion to approve a third storey in a residential zone where it does not satisfy clause 5.1.1(b)(ii), as this clause prevails over the general policy in the Scheme and over the RDC. It is therefore necessary for the applicant to revise the proposal to satisfy this requirement.

Building height

Clause 5.1.1(c) of TPS 2 contemplates an 8.5m maximum building height to the crown of a roof and a maximum wall height of 6m, measured from the NGL at the centre of the site. Council may vary this in exceptional cases where natural ground forms indicate that a variation is warranted provided that the amenity of the neighbouring area is not unreasonably diminished.

The traditional method used by Council for assessing concealed or flat roof designs has been to refer to the RDC which provide for a maximum wall height of 7m under the deemed-to-comply provisions.

It is proposed to construct the following:

- A curved gable-ended roof with a maximum height of 8.05m (RL: 22.3) above the calculated NGL (R: 14.25);
- Walls beneath the gable with maximum heights of 7.05m (RL: 21.3) above the calculated NGL; and
- A flat roof with a height of 8.05m (RL: 22.3) above the calculated NGL.

The overall height of the curved gable-ended roof is 0.45m below the maximum permitted height and therefore satisfies TPS 2. However, the proposed flat roof and walls below the curved gable-ended roof are 1.05m overheight and require approval by Council.

The overall site has a 3.53m fall from its north-east to south-west boundaries and is situated between two-storey dwellings on the northern side, and a two-storey dwelling fronting Margaret Street and a four storey block of units fronting Marine Parade on the southern side.

The existing dwellings on Lots 800 and 801 are owned by the same owner and are proposed to be demolished, whilst the existing dwelling on Lot 2, also owned by the same owner, is to be retained on a separate lot.

In considering the previous application for a dwelling on this site in 2009 Council approved the same wall height below the curved gable roof as that currently proposed, notwithstanding objections that were raised from the previous owner of 61 Margaret Street (since acquired and now to be demolished). The overall ridge height also remains the same as that previously approved. However, the proposed flat roof section that is approximately 32.5m² in area and located in the centre of the proposed dwelling, is 0.45m higher with a 2.5m ceiling height, although this could be reduced to 2.1m under the BCA which would reduce the overall building height.

The inclusion of 61 Margaret Street (Lot 801) in the current proposal allows the calculated NGL at the centre of the lot to be increased from RL:13.8 to RL:14.25 as Margaret Street is on the higher part of the site. As such, the building height variations are less than that previously approved. Furthermore, the inclusion of 236 Marine Parade (Lot 6) avoids any issue of overshadowing which was previously of concern to Council.

Therefore, having regard to TPS 2 and the RDC the proposed increased heights are supportable taking into account privacy, views, amenity, the desired height of building in the locality and overshadowing.

As assessed privacy and overshadowing satisfy the deemed-to-comply standards of the RDC and views of significance will not be significantly affected. Furthermore, whilst it is desirable to maintain low rise development in the locality, the presence of relatively high ridge lines on the existing adjoining properties would reduce the overall visual impact of the proposed dwelling in terms of bulk and scale. The applicant has shown the proposed heights in the context of the existing streetscape on drawing numbers A0.02 and A0.03, as well as shown the heights of the previous approved development on the site, which assists in demonstrating the potential visual impact of the proposed building heights on the existing streetscape.

Front setback to pool

An above-ground pool is proposed on the northern side of the site with a 5.4m minimum front setback, in lieu of Council's preferred 6m setback, and its wall height is approximately 2.4m which is significantly less than a single-storey building height for setback purposes. As the proposed dwelling has a front setback ranging from approximately 7m to 13m the proposed intrusion of the pool is well-compensated for by at least an equal area of open space behind the setback line. Furthermore, the total width of the proposed site is 40.24m (following amalgamation of four lots) and the area of the pool in the front setback area would only represent approximately 14% of the frontage so is unlikely to have any significant visual impact on the streetscape. The remainder of the site will also be extensively landscaped.

Although the pool could be designed to comply given the ample space available, Council previously approved a cantilevered pool with a 5m front setback located in front of the proposed dwelling on the site. The current pool design is setback further than the previous design, is to the side of the dwelling, and is on a significantly larger site.

Fencing in front setback

A solid wall ranging in height from 0.9m to 1.1m with open-aspect fencing above is proposed along the front of the site with an open-aspect sliding gate for vehicle access and entry gate for pedestrian access. A solid 1.8m high wall is also proposed along the southern boundary within the front setback area.

Although this constitutes a variation to Council's Fencing Local Law the proposed height variation to the solid section of wall along the front of the site is considered minor and would not have any significant adverse impact on the streetscape. However, the section of wall along the southern boundary within the front setback

should be amended to be of an open-aspect design above 0.9m to satisfy Local Law requirements. The owner will also need to liaise with the adjoining owners prior to commencement of works along the common boundary.

CONCLUSION

The proposed dwelling complies with TPS 2 and the RDC with the exception of the points discussed in this report. The original approval for a dwelling on the site has expired and although some earthworks were carried out within the necessary timeframe this is not considered sufficient to constitute substantial commencement of development.

The current application is similar to the previous proposal but contains various modifications which require consideration by Council. From a pure design prospective, despite its proportions, the proposal can be seen to suit the site and surrounds. Nonetheless, Council is unable to approve the development as submitted as it does not have discretion to approve three storeys in a residential zone.

COMMITTEE COMMENT

Committee was mindful of the site characteristics and the architectural concept, whilst also recognising the Scheme requirements and limitations. The Manager Development Services and the Senior Planning Officer explained how the aspects of number of storeys and height standards under the Scheme operated in relation to the design, which did not comply in some portions or required a degree of discretion for other portions, hence the necessary recommendation for revised plans to address those areas. As Committee was of the view that the basic design of the proposal had merit it was prepared to support approval on this basis.

VOTING

Simple Majority

OFFICER AND COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

Moved Mayor Dawkins, seconded Cr Angers

THAT Council:

- 1. GRANT its approval to commence development for a dwelling with undercroft at 236-242 (Lots 4, 5, 6 & 800) Marine Parade and 61 (Lot 801) Margaret Street (DA 2841) in accordance with the plans received on 19 May 2014, subject to the following conditions:**
 - (a) Revised plans being submitted showing the maximum building height not exceeding two storeys, except where permitted under Clause 5.1.1 (b)(ii) of Town Planning Scheme No. 2, to the satisfaction of the Manager Development Services.**
 - (b) All construction work being carried out in accordance with the Environmental Protection (Noise) Regulations 1997, Regulation 13. - Construction sites.**
 - (c) The external profile of the development as shown on the approved plans not being changed, whether by the addition of any service**

plant, fitting, fixture or otherwise, except with the written consent of Council.

- (d) All water draining from roofs and other impermeable surfaces shall be directed to garden areas, sumps or rainwater tanks within the development site where climatic and soil conditions allow for the effective retention of stormwater on-site.
- (e) The roof surface being treated to reduce glare if Council considers that the glare adversely affects the amenity of adjoining or nearby neighbours, following completion of the development.
- (f) 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.
- (g) The applicant applying to the Town for approval to construct a crossover in accordance with Council specifications, as approved by the Manager Engineering Services or an authorised officer.
- (h) The existing redundant crossover in Marine Parade shall be removed and the verge, kerb and all surfaces made good at the applicant's expense to the satisfaction of the Manager Engineering Services.
- (i) Lots 4, 5, 6, 800 and 801 shall be amalgamated into one lot prior to occupation of the dwelling.
- (j) All proposed fencing within the front setback area shall be in accordance with planning application DA 2838 or require a separate approval from Council.

Advice notes:

1. The owner/applicant is responsible for ensuring that all lot boundaries shown on the approved plans are correct and that the proposed development is constructed entirely within the owner's property.
 2. The owner/applicant is responsible to apply to the Town for a Building Permit and to obtain approval prior to undertaking construction of the development.
2. GRANT its approval to commence development for a pool, fencing and landscaping (DA 2838) at 236-242 (Lots 4, 5, 6 & 800) Marine Parade and 61 (Lot 801) Margaret Street in accordance with the plans received 19 May 2014, subject to the following conditions:

- (a) All construction work being carried out in accordance with the Environmental Protection (Noise) Regulations 1997, Regulation 13. – Construction sites.
- (b) The external profile of the development as shown on the approved plans not being changed, whether by the addition of any service plant, fitting, fixture or otherwise, except with the written consent of Council.
- (c) The proposed fencing within the front setback area may be solid to a maximum height of 900mm (with the exception of the minor height variation shown on the approved plans along the front boundary) and the infill panels shall have an “open aspect” in that the palings shall be spaced to ensure the width between each paling is at least equal to the width of the paling, with a minimum space of 50mm and a minimum open aspect of 50% of the infill panel, and the piers shall not exceed 2.1m in height from Natural Ground Level. Details shall be submitted at Building Permit stage.
- (d) The pool pump and filter 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 nuisance due to noise or vibration from mechanical equipment is satisfactorily minimized to within permissible levels outlined in the Environmental Protection (Noise) Regulations 1997.
- (e) Wastewater or backwash water from swimming pool filtration systems shall be contained within the boundary of the property on which the swimming pool is located and disposed of into adequate soakwells.
- (f) 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 of 1.8metres away from any building or boundary. Wastewater or backwash water shall not be disposed of into the street drainage system or the Water Corporation’s sewer.
- (g) Lots 4, 5, 6, 800 and 801 shall be amalgamated prior to completion of the works.
- (h) Construction of the pool shall not commence prior to approval of a Building Permit for the dwelling being issued.

Advice notes:

1. The owner/applicant is responsible to apply to the Town for a Building Permit and to obtain approval prior to undertaking construction of the development.

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

Carried 6/0

Mayor Dawkins declared an impartiality interest in Item 10.1.3, 19 Perth Street, due to being friends with the owners of the property and left the meeting at 6:50 PM for the duration of the item.

Cr Burke declared an Impartiality interest in Item 10.1.3, 19 Perth Street, due to knowing the owners of the property and stated that as a consequence there may be a perception that her impartiality may be affected and declared that she would consider the matter on its merits and vote accordingly.

10.1.3 NO. 19 PERTH STREET - PROPOSED DEMOLITION OF DWELLING

File Ref: 2896
Attachments: [19 Perth St Aerial](#)
[19 Perth St Floor Plan](#)
[19 Perth St Neighbouring Property Photos](#)
[19 Perth St MI Criteria Listing](#)
[19 Perth St Heritage Assessment](#)
[19 Perth St Heritage Opinion TOC](#)
[19 Perth St Objection Letters](#)

Responsible Officer: Carl Askew
Chief Executive Officer

Author: Andrew Jackson
Manager Development Services

Proposed Meeting Date: 16 June 2014

Author Disclosure of Interest: Nil

SUMMARY

A development application has been lodged by the owners of 19 Perth Street to demolish the heritage-classified dwelling, which is a planning consideration requiring Council's approval, prior to obtaining a demolition permit to undertake such work.

The property is classified in the Town's Municipal Inventory (MI) as a Category 2 place of heritage significance, which carries a preference for retention and conservation of heritage buildings rather than their loss through demolition.

This report assesses the proposal and heritage worth of the property and concludes that it would be desirable to decline the request for planning consent to demolish.

BACKGROUND

19 Perth Street has a long history of significance within the municipality and was fully-restored by the previous owners, preserving its heritage values and contributing to the streetscape as something of a local landmark.

The current owners are associated with a development company and aspire to demolish the dwelling in order to realise the redevelopment potential of the three lots comprising the land parcel. At this stage the applicant has no clear intention of whether to sell the lots or develop them with single or grouped dwellings, and therefore has not submitted plans of any replacement proposal.

The application contains a heritage assessment report by a consultancy (attached) which finds that demolition could be supported. In addition, the Town has obtained an opinion from another heritage-experienced architectural consultant on the proposal (attached).

STRATEGIC IMPLICATIONS

Heritage is recognised as a cornerstone of the character and amenity of Cottesloe, which Council aims to foster through the planning approvals process and related measures.

POLICY IMPLICATIONS

WAPC SPP 3.5 Historic Heritage Conservation
Town of Cottesloe Municipal Inventory
TPS2 Policy 12

STATUTORY ENVIRONMENT

Town Planning Scheme No. 2
Local Planning Scheme No. 3

CONSULTATION

Initially the Town received enquiries from neighbours who had heard that the owners were contemplating demolition, which was followed by local press coverage and then receipt of the application. Subsequently some concerned persons expressed objections to the proposal to the Town and/or in the local press, as well as emailed Elected Members urging against demolition.

Given this level of enquiry and concern, the Town wrote to fifteen Perth Street owners in the vicinity of the property confirming that an application had been made and inviting comment. Several responses resulted (attached), as summarised below:

Name	Locality	Comment
D Hyde	Perth Street	Greatly concerned at demolition. Long-time residents whose families grew up in street. Provides personal historical insights. Witnessed decline of the property then its loving restoration. Writer was on Heritage Walk Trail committee identifying beautiful old homes such as this. There are few well-known heritage properties in the east ward and only a few remaining in Perth Street, which still has an overall ambience. Pictorial records alone are a sad substitute for the real thing. Need to protect heritage and be proud of history, as so many properties have been lost – this one is well worth preserving.
P&J Roberts	Perth Street	Very concerned about destruction of grand old buildings in WA, compared to considerable conservation overseas – can't fathom our

		demolition mentality. Values the property as gracious, with an interesting history. Hopes Council will consider keeping the property and including it in the Heritage List.
V Formby	Perth Street	Concerned at demolition. Dwelling is stately and in excellent condition. Houses aren't built like it anymore, which are important to Cottesloe's heritage. The place has historical value and is well-displayed. It could become a community asset. Hopes Council will strive to save the beautiful building and its rare architecture.
Greg Jude	Cottesloe	Former owner and restorer of the property. Objects to demolition. Supports its strengthened heritage status. Provides restoration information.
DL Jones	Cottesloe	Heritage listing of property should be upgraded. Demolition would be a travesty. Provides historical information.
E Lindsay	Country WA	Concerned at so few heritage properties generally in WA. Advocates mandatory heritage protection and demolition consent. Prevent heritage vandalism and save this house.
J Loveland	Mornington VIC	Descendent of original owner. Appalled at and objects to demolition, which would be a travesty – urges refusal. Cites outstanding architectural example and excellent condition and promotes community value of property. Provides family history details.
Petition	Perth and Napier Sts; Shenton Rd, Claremont.	Letter and 25 signatures from 14 properties in Perth St, three in Napier St and one in Shenton Rd. Asks Council to defer item pending outcome of State Register nomination application [now known]. Further historical information has been found and is provided. Refers to Hocking Heritage Studio report and seeks time for a report from another heritage architect [which the Town has obtained]. 19 Perth St has contributed much to the social and historical fabric of the community and should be preserved.

This feedback is useful and should be had regard to in several respects. It demonstrates that: (i) heritage conservation and protection practices are a reflection of community values; (ii) the place is well-known and valued by the local community and persons elsewhere with connections to the place; (iii) the place has a strong association with the street and its residents, including some long term residents with intimate knowledge of its history; and (iv) the property is much-admired and in the eyes of the community does not deserve to be demolished.

The previous owner provided a gift to the community in retrieving 19 Perth Street from its dilapidated state and restoring the property to its former glory, resurrecting

and enhancing its heritage value and its contribution to the street for all to experience. The current owner has obviously enjoyed the heritage quality, amenity and prestige of the property as part of the street. 19 Perth Street would appeal to many potential purchasers for its charm, character, heritage significance and fascinating history. It is axiomatic that the preferable attitude to heritage properties of cultural heritage significance disfavours demolition.

HERITAGE CONSIDERATIONS

Assessment framework

There is a well-defined planning and heritage framework for assessment of the demolition proposal, as set out below.

Western Australian Planning Commission (WAPC) Heritage Policy

The WAPC State Planning Policy (SPP) 3.5 Historic Heritage Conservation was gazetted in 2007. The Policy has statutory bearing and its objectives are:

- to conserve places and areas of historic heritage significance;
- to ensure that development does not adversely affect the significance of heritage places and areas;
- to ensure that heritage significance at both the State and local levels is given due weight in planning decision-making; and
- to provide improved certainty to landowners and the community about the planning process for heritage identification, conservation and protection.

The Policy describes the statutory framework for heritage conservation and the relationship and responsibilities of the HCWA, the WAPC and local governments.

It also specifies policy measures and the means for their implementation and requires local governments to have regard to specific matters relating to heritage in considering applications for planning approval. Those matters relevant to the proposed development include:

- the conservation and protection of any place or area that has been registered in the register of heritage places under the Heritage Act or is the subject of a conservation order under the Act, or which is included in the heritage list under a Scheme;
- the level of heritage significance of the place, based on a relevant heritage assessment;
- measures proposed to conserve the heritage significance of the place and its setting; and
- the structural condition of the place, and whether the place is reasonably capable of conservation.

Local government has a role in applying and supporting the policy through ensuring that due regard is given to heritage significance in development assessment, planning schemes and planning strategies.

Proposals should aim to meet this overarching policy guidance, satisfy the heritage values associated with the particular place under its heritage classifications, and address the heritage-related requirements of the local government's planning scheme and policies.

Municipal Heritage Inventory (MI)

The property is classified as Category 2 in the Town's MI, in which the description and history of the place is as follows:

An elegant presence in the street and of historic importance as a hospital and brothel. The original section of this house has historical significance for being constructed on part of the original subdivision prior to 1901.

A large timber-framed house built before 1901 with symmetrical front comprising a door and sidelights and flanking double-hung sash windows with flanking coupled sidelights. There is a major gable over the front door and surrounding bull-nosed verandah. It commenced life as a smaller cottage and has been enlarged at some time during its life.

In 1905 owned by Alfred Loveland, labourer. Nurse Loveland and her daughter Naomi had four rooms of this house as a hospital at some time. Reputed to also have been a boarding house and a brothel.

The associated Management Category statement defines the importance of Category 2 as:

Maximum incentives under Town Planning Scheme. High level of protection appropriate. Provide maximum encouragement to the owner under the Town Planning Scheme to conserve the significance of the place. Photographically record the place prior to any major redevelopment or demolition.

The Town's website elaborates that:

Buildings in Category 2 of the Municipal Inventory are considered to be highly important in terms of local heritage significance. Demolition approvals may be granted by the Council upon review and subsequent downgrading of the listing. As is the case with all buildings, development approval is required for any proposed alterations or additions.

TPS2 Policy 12

19 Perth Street is also contained in this Scheme Policy, which reinforces its heritage significance by being identified for consideration of inclusion in Schedule 1 of the Scheme, for statutory protection. The Policy objective is:

To protect existing places of cultural heritage significance, and to maintain the character, amenity and sense of place of the suburb.

The Policy states that:

The places identified in Categories 1 and 2 of the Municipal Inventory contribute significantly to the character of Cottesloe, and Council is conscious that they form an integral part of the character, amenity and sense of place of the suburb.

Clause 5.1.2(b) of the Town Planning Scheme text requires Council to have regard to the need for the preservation of buildings of architectural or historical interest.

The Council considers that those properties described in Clause 6 [of the Policy] are buildings of architectural and historical interest for the purpose of Clause 5.1.2(b) of Town Planning Scheme No. 2.

Demolition of places covered by this policy will not be supported by Council, unless it is demonstrated to Council's satisfaction that the listed building is not of local cultural heritage significance.

Review of MI Category 2 Places

In 2005 the Town undertook a review of MI Category 2 places and evaluation criteria towards an improved appreciation of heritage in the district, better protection of places and a future heritage list for LPS3.

The study report recommended that 19 Perth Street be retained as Category 2 and given higher protection by inclusion in Schedule 1 of TPS2 (extract attached). This outlook is consistent with TPS2 Policy 12.

This work was performed by Hocking Planning & Architecture, now known as Hocking Heritage Studio, the consultancy currently acting for the applicant wishing to demolish the property. The study did not envisage demolition of the places reviewed and certainly did not foresee 19 Perth Street as a candidate for demolition.

It is noted that the report in discussing the evaluation process for Category 2 places subject to development applications advised:

The other redevelopment situation that needs to be addressed is whether Category 2 heritage places may be replaced by contemporary structures or significantly adapted.

CAT 2 heritage places, determined by objective assessment methods, have that value ascribed by the community. Hocking Planning & Architecture considers that Category 2 places should only be considered for replacement by contemporary places of potentially greater cultural heritage value. The onus would be on the proponent to demonstrate how this principle would be satisfied.

As mentioned, at this stage there is no replacement redevelopment proposal by the applicant or any purchaser of the lots. It is unlikely that any modern housing

developed on the land parcel could surpass the values derived from the heritage place and its significant presence in the street.

LPS3 draft Heritage List

Echoing this identified heritage value, it is further intended to include the property in the Heritage List to be created under imminent LPS3. The new Scheme is in the process of being endorsed for final approval and gazettal, upon which it will become effective. It therefore constitutes a “seriously entertained planning proposal” as a relevant planning consideration that Council can take into account.

Under LPS3 statutory heritage protection is to be afforded by a Heritage List to be created pursuant to Part 7, with listed properties drawn from (but not limited to) the MI:

7.1.1. The local government is to establish and maintain a Heritage List to identify those places within the Scheme area which are of cultural heritage significance and worthy of conservation under the provisions of the Scheme, together with a description of each place and the reasons for its entry.

7.1.2. In the preparation of the Heritage List the local government is to —

- (a) have regard to the municipal inventory prepared by the local government under section 45 of the Heritage of Western Australia Act 1990; and*
- (b) include on the Heritage List such of the entries on the municipal inventory as it considers to be appropriate.*

The Town has commenced preparation of a draft heritage list, including properties listed in the State Register of Heritage Places, TPS2 Schedule 1 and Policy 12, and the MI Categories 1 and 2, with a view to creation pursuant to LPS3 upon its commencement. Hence the aim is to accord 19 Perth Street a higher level of heritage protection.

Heritage Council of WA

A concerned submitter (DL Jones) has researched the heritage significance of 19 Perth Street and lodged a Heritage Nomination with the State Heritage Office (SHO) for the place to be considered for inclusion in the State Heritage Register.

The Heritage Council’s Register Committee has given preliminary consideration to the nomination and the SHO has advised that whilst the place has cultural heritage significance this is of a local nature rather than state-level for classification, and that the Town should consider protecting the place through the Heritage List in its town planning scheme [ie as intended].

This does not lessen the local heritage significance of the place and its corresponding classifications.

ASSESSMENT

Introduction

Heritage is fundamentally about saving, conserving, respecting and appreciating places of cultural heritage significance. Where a place has already been assessed and classified as being of significance, the presumption is in favour of retention and appropriate heritage treatment, and the encouragement of such, as opposed to allowing heritage places to deteriorate or be lost. The very purpose of heritage as a philosophy is orientated towards preserving and fostering places exhibiting cultural heritage values.

Even the most dilapidated heritage properties can be kept, restored and added to or adapted to be actively used and enjoyed, rather than lapse to demolition. In Cottesloe, *Le Fanu* is a prime example of a virtual ruin having been faithfully repaired and sympathetically extended instead of demolition being sought. Hocking Heritage Studio was the consultancy responsible for that successful outcome.

Applicant's heritage report

The Town is aware that the applicant initially approached another heritage consultancy to prepare an assessment report for the proposal, but the consultancy felt that it could not support demolition of the place. The applicant has since engaged Hocking Heritage Studio to provide a report on the proposed demolition (attached). The Town makes the following observations about the report having regard to the above background and framework.

The consultant's report assesses whether demolition of the dwelling could be allowed, having regard to established criteria for determining heritage worth. It must be emphasised that the property is already classified as being of heritage significance, which is not under review.

It should be noted that the 2005 review undertaken for the Town by the same consultancy confirmed the MI Category 2 status of 19 Perth Street, as well as recommended that it be protected via Schedule 1 of TPS2. The present assessment report by the consultancy omits to mention the recommendation for inclusion in Schedule 1 and attempts to diminish the bearing of TPS2 Policy 12.

The report identifies that assessed against the nine criteria 19 Perth Street has a number of important cultural heritage values, ranked from little to high. This reveals that three criteria (a one third minority) are considered to have little, some or low significance, and that six criteria (a two-thirds majority) are found to have moderate, good or high significance. It should be noted that the weight of values attributable to the place validates its heritage classification and the objective of preservation.

The report acknowledges that the place demonstrates cultural heritage value, which it does not dispute. The report advises that: the dwelling is a good example of its era/type and retains many of its original architectural features, which can be visibly appreciated; the place reflects the early settlement pattern, has aesthetic value, is one of the grander houses in the street, the only one of its kind in the street and contributes to the mixed character of the street; it has aesthetic value in its own right,

has specific [and locally uncommon] historic value and local social value [note: the submissions from the community elaborate on this]; and the dwelling is quite representative and in good condition, with a high level of integrity and a moderate degree of authenticity, and has been restored and well maintained.

On this basis it is plainly apparent that the property possesses suitable cultural heritage significance verifying its classification and the preference of retention. Yet the consultancy report, whilst articulating these values and their associated evidence, proceeds to argue that they can be dismissed. To do so, the report raises the concept of heritage context and contends that this sustains the proposed demolition, whereby if the setting of a heritage place is sufficiently altered over time its worth may be affected.

However, this construct is at odds with other dimensions of heritage. Firstly, heritage recognises both individual and collective significance; that is, the intrinsic value of each place in its own right (as the consultant has found for the property), as well as the contribution of any extant context in enhancing a place. Secondly, context underpins the mechanism of a heritage area as enshrined in town planning schemes, which is aimed at defining and conserving a group of places, which may include places of individual distinction. That is, a place does not have to possess a strong context or need to be in a heritage area to be significant, as its stand-alone value is intact despite the absence or evolution of context.

Were context adhered to as the key determinant in heritage assessment and in deciding upon proposed demolition, then many singular or isolated places of cultural heritage significance could be demolished premised simply on lacking context. This could be the case with numerous places of local, state, national or international significance, many of which are one of a kind and/or devoid of their historical context.

The reality is that as settlements change, heritage places, even if few and far between or closed-in by more subsequent development, retain their intrinsic value, becoming in that sense rarer and may be seen as landmarks or iconic. Many historical buildings comprising public places or private properties exist today by themselves with their original surroundings long gone, yet are valued for their past and protected from demolition. As an analogy, a significant painting of value by a well-known artist would not be deemed unworthy for want of any other works by that person; indeed, although having several paintings would add to its appreciation, not having them makes the one more special.

The report concludes that 19 Perth Street has cultural heritage significance and merits its MI Category 2 classification. Despite that it then references the notion of context to discount this worth as “token” and puts that demolition of the property would not matter. The officer assessment is that this proposition is an unreasonable diminution of the value of heritage places and undermines heritage philosophy.

The consultant’s summation is that demolition of the property would not harm the mixed streetscape. The converse view to the questionable rationale advanced is that the property is a distinguished gem in a narrow street of predominantly smaller lots and dwellings of interesting and eclectic style, including several older cottages (photos attached). The place is not anomalous; the dwelling is a surviving and well-restored attractive feature with a degree of grandeur which enhances the street and

neighbourhood. Demolition would be detrimental to the street as a quite dramatic change and a marked loss of heritage value spanning more than a century of the district's history and development.

Town's heritage architect's opinion

The Town has obtained a detailed opinion (attached) from another heritage architect with substantial experience, Mr Antony Ednie-Brown, who has reviewed the applicable material and the Hocking Heritage Studio report.

This advice provides a deeper analysis of the appropriate approach to assessment of the proposal to demolish the heritage place. It is unable to agree to the grounds argued by the applicant's consultant. It offers a more complete and sensitive appreciation of heritage evaluation and historical significance, including the facets of streetscape, sense of place and context.

This overview supports the higher-level local heritage status of 19 Perth Street and its preservation in perpetuity, and concludes that demolition would be a retrograde act. It arrives at the correct conclusion that the property should be preserved and protected.

CONCLUSION

The proposal has been assessed in accordance with the relevant heritage framework and it is clear that the property is of higher-order local cultural heritage significance. This is recognised by its heritage classifications, both existing and intended (ie to be elevated to town planning scheme level of protection). The community-held value is also manifest by the objections lodged to the prospect of demolition and historical information supplied about the property.

The status and thrust of the heritage classifications is retention and preservation of the place. Demolition runs counter to that. The street setting does not unduly devalue the heritage qualities of the property, which actually benefits the street. The danger of the context argument is that a great many places could be flagged for demolition, resulting in the widespread destruction of heritage properties.

It is concluded that demolition is undesirable and unjustified.

COMMITTEE COMMENT

Committee was unanimous that the heritage place should be preserved rather than demolished, noting that it has a considerable history. The Manager Development Services confirmed that the property has been classified in the MI (Category 2) for many years, including when the property was purchased by the present owners in more recent years. The Manager Development Services also confirmed that the heritage consultancy, currently acting for the owners, had produced the Town's 2005 MI Category 2 Review (which supported protection of the place). He further advised that although the HCWA had concluded to not add the place to the State Heritage Register, it had encouraged the Town to protect the place via the Scheme Heritage List and had not suggested the place could be demolished, which is a matter for Council to determine.

VOTING

Simple Majority

OFFICER AND COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

Moved Cr Walsh, seconded Cr Angers

THAT Council REFUSES the application for planning consent to demolish 19 Perth Street, Cottesloe, for the following reasons:

- 1. The property is a place of cultural heritage significance included in the Town's Municipal Inventory and Town Planning Scheme Policy 12, as well as recommended to be included for heritage protection in existing Town Planning Scheme No. 2 and in proposed Local Planning Scheme No. 3.**
- 2. The heritage place has been restored to a high standard and is in excellent condition, contributing to the character and amenity of the street. Demolition of the heritage place would be detrimental to the street and locality.**
- 3. The assessment provided by the applicant is not considered to be a convincing rationale for demolition of the heritage place.**
- 4. An alternative heritage opinion provided to the Town supports that the heritage place ought to be retained and preserved.**
- 5. Submissions invited by the Town in response to community concerns expressed about the proposed demolition attest to the cultural heritage significance of the place, and the information provided augments the knowledge of its history and fosters the appreciation of its values.**

Carried 5/0

Mayor Dawkins returned to the meeting at 6:54 pm.

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

Nil.

12 NEW BUSINESS OF AN URGENT NATURE INTRODUCED BY DECISION OF MEETING BY:

12.1 ELECTED MEMBERS

Nil.

12.2 OFFICERS

Nil.

13 MEETING CLOSED TO PUBLIC

13.1 MATTERS FOR WHICH THE MEETING MAY BE CLOSED

Nil.

13.2 PUBLIC READING OF RECOMMENDATIONS THAT MAY BE MADE PUBLIC

Nil.

14 MEETING CLOSURE

The Presiding Member announced the closure of the meeting at 6:56 PM.

CONFIRMED MINUTES OF 16 June 2014 PAGES 1 - 33 INCLUSIVE.

PRESIDING MEMBER:
POSITION:

.....

DATE: / /