### DEVELOPMENT ASSESSMENT REPORT Shire of Augusta Margaret River 30 November to 6 December 2023

# APPLICATIONS RECEIVED

Date Rec'd	Reference No.	Address	Proposal
PLANNING	NO.		
30/11/2023	P223814	53 (Lot 722) Trinder Drive, Margaret River	Section 40
30/11/2023	P223816	Unit 2, 35 (Lot 2) Stewart Street, Margaret River	Holiday House Renewal
30/11/2023	P223819	9 (Lot 396) Pimelia Drive, Margaret River	Single House (Patio)
01/12/2023	P223822	Lot 1003 Redgate Road, Witchcliffe	Local Development Plan (The Leeuwin at Witchcliffe)
01/12/2023	P223823	104 (Lot 36) Ashton Street, Margaret River	Single House and Outbuilding
04/12/2023	P223824	24 (Lot 136) Tonkin Boulevard, Margaret River	Bed and Breakfast
04/12/2023	P223826	Unit B, 10 (Lot 1) Freycinet Way, Gnarabup	Dwelling Additions
04/12/2023	P223827	Lot 2770 Warner Glen Road, Warner Glen	Dam
05/12/2023	P223828	427 (Lot 12) Brockman Road, Cowaramup	Amendment to P220192 (Home Occupation)
05/12/2023	P223829	6 (Lot 3) Loriini Lane, Cowaramup	Holiday House
05/12/2023	P223830	341 (Lot 3135) Boodjidup Road, Margaret River	Eagles Heritage - Covered Viewing Areas
05/12/2023	P223831	Lot 401 Benbow Road, Karridale	Outbuilding
06/12/2023	P223832	Lot 30 Peake Street, Cowaramup	Chalets and Caretakers Dwelling
06/12/2023	P223834	1 (Lot 601) Truffle Circuit, Cowaramup	Single House
06/12/2023	P223835	1 (Lot 1) Chuditch Place, Gnarabup	Outbuilding Additions
BUILDING			
30/11/2023	223628	345 (Lot 5) Arthur Road, Rosa Brook	Farm Shed and Lean too
30/11/2023	223629	25 (Lot 325) Ibis Court, Karridale	Single Dwelling, Verandah, Patio, Retaining Wall, Shed/Workshop, Rainwater Tank, Shed with Verandah
30/11/2023	223630	143 (Lot 14) Green Hill Road, Augusta	Rainwater Tank
01/12/2023	223631	Unit 133, 96 (Lot 33) Bussell Highway, Margaret River	Occupancy Permit for BLD223310
01/12/2023	223632	164 (Lot 2) Freshwater Drive, Burnside	Rainwater Tank
01/12/2023	223633	43 (Lot 13) Karrack Crescent, Witchcliffe	Single Dwelling, Carport, Patio and Rainwater Tank
01/12/2023	223634	8 (Lot 15) Mayflower Place, East Augusta	Alterations and Additions to Existing Dwelling and Patio
04/12/2023	223635	8 (Lot 253) Felling Road, Karridale	Rainwater Tank
04/12/2023	223636	41 (Lot 198) McDermott Parade, Witchcliffe	Above Ground Swimming Pool/Spa and Safety Barrier
04/12/2023	223637	11 (Lot 6) Tyrone Loop, Margaret River	Swimming Pool Barrier Fence
04/12/2023	223638	7 (Lot 29) Nelligan Place, Cowaramup	Single Dwelling
05/12/2023	223639	11 (Lot 301) Logging Road, Karridale	Single Dwelling, Carport, Patio, Verandah and Rainwater Tank
05/12/2023	223640	Unit 6A (Lot 103) Brady Street, Augusta	Three Storey Dwelling, Lift Shaft, Balcony, Retaining Walls and Garage
05/12/2023	223641	Lot 398 Maclaren Crescent, Margaret River	Grouped Dwelling, Patios and Garages
05/12/2023	223642	2 (Lot 600) Niblett Retreat, Margaret River	Above Ground Swimming Pool and Barrier Fence
Exploration Li	censes for Co	omment	

# APPL/ICATIONS DETERMINED UNDER DELEGATION

Date Rec'd	Reference No.	Address	Proposal	Outcome
PLANNING				
27/10/2022	P222728	805 (Lot 102) Osmington Road, Osmington	Agriculture Intensive (Garlic production, Retrospective Vineyard, New Farm Building & Retrospective Farm Building)	Approved

18/09/2023	P223596	49 (Lot 26) Mentelle Road, Burnside	Holiday House Renewal	Approved
10/10/2023	P223642	22 (Lot 24) Treeside Lane, Margaret River	Holiday House	Approved
08/11/2023	P223742	14 (Lot 534) Hibbertia Terrace, Margaret River	Home Occupation (Nail Salon)	Approved
14/11/2023	P223753	9 (Lot 292) Mann Street, Margaret River	Holiday House Cancellation	Approved
17/11/2023	P223773	3 (Lot 47) Chaudiere Place, Augusta	Holiday House Cancellation	Approved
22/11/2023	P223781	5 (Lot 94) Humble Way, Margaret River	Bed and Breakfast Cancellation	Approved
SUBDIVISION	NS		1	
18/10/2023	P223707	25 (Lot 81) Turner Street, Augusta	Survery Strata	Supported with conditions
18/10/2023	P223741	125 (Lot 1) Bussell Highway, Margaret River & 129 (Lot 22) Bussell Highway, Margaret River		Supported with conditions
LOCAL LAW	PERMITS			
06/11/2023	P223765	2 (Lot 24) O'Brien Street, Cowaramup dining adjacent to Temper Temper café		Approved
15/11/2023	P223785	Portion of Higgins Street Road Reserve, adjacent to 73 (Lot 5) Bussell Highway, Margaret RiverPermit to operate alfresco dining, adjacent to La Scarepetta Trattoria		Approved
17/11/2023	P223786	Fearn Avenue Precinct, Bussell     Permit to operate weekly       Highway, Margaret River     busking sessions in Fearn       Avenue Precinct - Radio     Margaret River		Cancelled
21/11/2023	P223787	Adjacent to Pearl's Bar, Portion of Bussell Highway Road ReservePermit to operate alfresco area adjacent to Pearl's Bar		Approved
23/11/2023	P223796	Adjacent to Settlers Tavern, BussellPermit to operate alfresco areaHighway Road Reserve, adjacent to 114adjacent to Settlers TavernBussell Highway, Margaret Riveradjacent to Settlers Tavern		Approved
27/11/2023	P223821	Adjacent to Margaret River Tuckshop 147 Bussell Highway, Margaret River	Permit to operate Alfresco dining area adjacent to Margaret River Tuckshop	Approved

# LEVEL 3 PLANNING APPLICATIONS FOR DETERMINATION

Date Rec'd	Reference No.	Address	Proposal	Recommendation
PLANNING				
14/09/2023	P223584	5 (Lot 20) Tallwood Loop, Witchcliffe	Outbuilding - Shed	Approval with conditions

# DEVELOPMENT ASSESSMENT REPORTING PROCEDURE

### Assessment of Development Applications (DAs)

For the purposes of this procedure there are three types of development applications:

## Level 1

DA not advertised

## Level 2

DA is advertised; and

- No submissions; or
- Submission received but meets one of the following:
  - Not related to the reason the DA was advertised.
  - The development is modified to comply or to remove the element of concern to the submitter.
  - Submission is either of support, conditional support or is 'indifferent'; or is from a non-affected person.

#### Level 3

A submission in opposition is received from an 'affected' person or special interest group in relation to the reason the DA is advertised or the development application is recommended for refusal.

**Note:** This procedure applies to development applications only. It does not apply to structure plans, scheme amendments or other types of planning proposals.



# DEVELOPMENT APPLICATION ASSESSMENT Report to Manager Planning and Regulatory Services

Proposed Outbuilding - Shed 5 (Lot 20) Tallwood Loop Witchcliffe

## Level 3

# P223584; PTY/13028

REPORTING OFFICER	:	Suzi Magnall
DISCLOSURE OF INTEREST	:	Nil

General Information	
Lot Area	2000m <sup>2</sup>
Zone	Residential 'R5'
Proposed Development	Planning approval is sought for a proposed shed adjacent to the existing dwelling at the rear of the site.
	The proposal presents a variation to LPS1 4.21.2 (d) with a side setback of 1.2m proposed in lieu of the required 5m. The proposed shed is sited adjacent to the existing dwelling which presents a variation to LPP1 AD1.4 for outbuildings to be located behind the dwelling.
Permissible Use Class	'P' Permitted Use
Heritage/Aboriginal Sites	None Identified
Encumbrance	1x Restrictive Covenant
	2x Notifications
Date Received	14/09/2023





Policy Requirements	
Is the land or proposal re	eferred to in any Council Policy? $\sqrt{ ext{Yes}}$ $\Box$ No
If yes, state the Policy/Po	blicies Local Planning Policy 1 (LPP1) Outbuildings, Farm Buildings and Swimming Pools
Officer Comment	The proposed outbuilding is to be positioned to the east of the existing ancillary dwelling, resulting in a variation to LPP1 AD1.4 which requires outbuildings to be located behind the front of the existing dwelling. It is noted that when the main dwelling is built in the future, the proposed location would comply with this clause of the policy. Until such a time occurs, the shed being adjacent to the existing building creates a linear appearance, is compatible with other development in the surrounding
	<ul> <li>area and will have least impact on the streetscape.</li> <li>The proposed outbuilding complies with the specific Performance Criteria of LPP1 as follows: <ul> <li>PC1.1 – It is modest in size and an appropriate form and scale, in an appropriate location consistent with the visual management guidelines of the Local Planning Strategy;</li> <li>PC1.2 – It is constructed of colours and materials that complement the landscape and existing dwelling;</li> <li>PC1.3 – Will not have an impact or detract from the streetscape or amenity of neighbouring properties; and</li> <li>PC1.4 – Is grouped with the residence to limit potential adverse impact and proportionally scaled relative to the dwelling on site.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
	cal Development Plans (LDP's)
	re Plan Area or subject to a LDP? $\sqrt{Yes}$ $\Box$ No
If yes, state the Policy/Po	blicies Leeuwin Parklands Estate, Witchcliffe Local Development Plan Approved 8 July 2019

Officer Comment         The Local Development Plan (LDP) for this subdivision allows for a reduced side setaback of or outbuilding is located to the side of the subdivision allows for a reduced side setaback of outbuilding is located to the side of the subdivising name within is greater than the developments of LPS is to be LDP reduce cannot be applied and the 5m side of the subsiting (ancillary) which large sites to be LDP. For each cannot be applied and the 5m side setaback specified in LPS is relevant here.           Due to limited space adjacent to the existing ancillary, the outbuilding only achieves a statuck of 1.2m from the east boundary, which fails to satisfy the requirements of LPS in the base of the boundary. In the outbuilding only achieves a statuck of 1.2m from the east boundary, which fails to satisfy the requirements of LPS in the base of 1.2m for the east boundary. Which fails to satisfy the requirements of LPS in the sature of 1.2P. For the east of 1.2m for the east boundary, which signates the advection in the with the ancillary development of LPS in the sature outbuilding only achieves a statuck of 1.2m software the sature of 1.2m software the proposal is int-keaping with the gammal intent of the LDP and will not determine the sature of neighbours.           Planning History         M/A           M/A         Advertising/Agency Reforms           Has the application         ben referred to adjoining views accessed development process allows the Plan mode set advectors.           Summary of Objection:         No.           Indowners/agency?         Vas           Has a subom								
M/A         Advertising/Agency Referrats         Has the application been referred to adjoining indowners/agency?         Has aubmission been received by Council?       \fraction yes         No. received: 1         Summary of Objection:         Neghbouring resident -         I built within the required restrictions to the detriment of my reporty value. Others should be held to the same restrictions.       Officer Comment:         The Development Application process allows the Plant property value. Others should be held to the same restrictions.       Officer Comment: The Development Application process allows the Plant property value. Others should be held to the same advelopment proposal has constructed to their site, and his option is available to every the this instance, the proponent has constructed to advelopment completed. The proposal satisfies the performance crite of the relevant LPP and LDP as detailed above.         Assessment of Application       Is the land referred in the Heritage Inventory?         Are there any compliance issues in relation to existing development?       I Yes         Are R Codes applicable?       I Yes         Are the proposed building height       Wall – 3.1m         Scheme / Pology Requimement       Wall – 2.7m <t< th=""><th>Officer Comment</th><th>for non-ha standards outbuilding cannot be Due to lin setback of LDP. How located fo boundary the 1.2m s The shed 3.2m. The boundary, It is consid</th><th>bitable stri in LPP1. I g is located applied ar hited spac 1.2m fron ever, the s rwards of is characte setback will is modest adjacent p so there is lered the p</th><th>uctures locate However, as the d to the side of ad the 5m side e adjacent to n the east bou- side location in this building eristic of the a l be a margina in size with a for property has a s no perceived proposal is in-l</th><th>d behind the one main dwelling the existing ( e setback spect the existing and andary, which line with the a line at this s rea and when a variation to the loor area of 24 water tank in a impact for ne</th><th>dwelling, whi ing has not y ancillary) dw sified in LPS ancillary, the fails to satis ancillary dwe tage. The I the main d the LDP star 4.6m<sup>2</sup>, a wal the south we sighbours.</th><th>ich is greater than the developr yet been constructed, the propo- velling on site, so the LDP reduce 1 is relevant here. e outbuilding only achieves a sfy the requirements of LPS1 of elling is preferable to the shed b inear development along the welling is constructed in the fut hodards. I height of 2.7m and gable height estern corner adjacent to the sha</th><th>side r the being rear ture, ht of ared</th></t<>	Officer Comment	for non-ha standards outbuilding cannot be Due to lin setback of LDP. How located fo boundary the 1.2m s The shed 3.2m. The boundary, It is consid	bitable stri in LPP1. I g is located applied ar hited spac 1.2m fron ever, the s rwards of is characte setback will is modest adjacent p so there is lered the p	uctures locate However, as the d to the side of ad the 5m side e adjacent to n the east bou- side location in this building eristic of the a l be a margina in size with a for property has a s no perceived proposal is in-l	d behind the one main dwelling the existing ( e setback spect the existing and andary, which line with the a line at this s rea and when a variation to the loor area of 24 water tank in a impact for ne	dwelling, whi ing has not y ancillary) dw sified in LPS ancillary, the fails to satis ancillary dwe tage. The I the main d the LDP star 4.6m <sup>2</sup> , a wal the south we sighbours.	ich is greater than the developr yet been constructed, the propo- velling on site, so the LDP reduce 1 is relevant here. e outbuilding only achieves a sfy the requirements of LPS1 of elling is preferable to the shed b inear development along the welling is constructed in the fut hodards. I height of 2.7m and gable height estern corner adjacent to the sha	side r the being rear ture, ht of ared
M/A         Advertising/Agency Referrats         Has the application been referred to adjoining indowners/agency?         Has aubmission been received by Council?       \fraction yes         No. received: 1         Summary of Objection:         Neghbouring resident -         I built within the required restrictions to the detriment of my reporty value. Others should be held to the same restrictions.       Officer Comment:         The Development Application process allows the Plant property value. Others should be held to the same restrictions.       Officer Comment: The Development Application process allows the Plant property value. Others should be held to the same advelopment proposal has constructed to their site, and his option is available to every the this instance, the proponent has constructed to advelopment completed. The proposal satisfies the performance crite of the relevant LPP and LDP as detailed above.         Assessment of Application       Is the land referred in the Heritage Inventory?         Are there any compliance issues in relation to existing development?       I Yes         Are R Codes applicable?       I Yes         Are the proposed building height       Wall – 3.1m         Scheme / Pology Requimement       Wall – 2.7m <t< td=""><th>Planning History</th><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></t<>	Planning History							
Has the application been referred to adjoining andowners/agency?       \Yes       No       N/A         Has a submission been received by Council?       \Yes       No       N/A         Summary of Objection:       No       No. received: 1         No. received: 1       Officer Comment:       The Development Application process allows the Plann proposals that seel vary the deemed-to-comply requirements of the RCouncil and the required restrictions.         I built within the required restrictions to the detriment of my property value. Others should be held to the same restrictions.       Officer Comment:         The Development Application restrictions.       Inits instance, the proposal has been assessed for the main dwelling which has turn, determined the most suitable location for outbuilding. The proposal astisfies the performance crite of the relevant LPP and LDP as detailed above.         Assessment of Application       Is the land referred in the Heritage Inventory?       Yes       √No         Are there any compliance issues in relation to existing development?       Yes       √No         R codes       Applicable?       Yes       √No         Development Standards (Schedule 9)       Are the evelopment Standards applicable?       Yes       √No         Development Standards applicable?       Yes       √No       No       Development Standards applicable?         No       Roof = 3.2m       Vis       No       Development Standar								
Has the application been referred to adjoining andowners/agency?       √ Yes       No       N/A         Has a submission been received by Council?       √ Yes       No       N/A         Summary of Objection:       Ves       No       N/A         No. received: 1       Officer Comment:       The Development Application process allows the Plann proposals that seel vary the deemed-to-comply requirements of the RCounce assess development proposals that seel vary the deemed-to-comply requirements of the RCounce assesses development proposals that seel vary the deemed-to-comply requirements of the RCounce assesses of the relevant the required restrictions.         Summary of Application       Use as a submission been received by Council?       Officer Comment:         Figure 1       Assessment of Application       Use assessement of the Heritage Inventory?       Use assessed velopment future development completed. The proposal satisfies the performance crite of the relevant LPP and LDP as detailed above.         Assessment of Application       Is the land referred in the Heritage Inventory?       Yes √ No         Is the land referred in the Heritage Inventory?       Yes √ No       Yes       No         Are there any compliance issues in relation to existing development?       Yes √ No       Yes       No         Recodes applicable?       Yes       √ No       No       No         Development Standards (Schedule 9)       Are there any compliance issues any licable?       Y								
Iandowners/agency?       Image: New Discrete Structure         Has a submission been received by Council?       \free New Discrete New Oil N/A         Summary of Objection:       No. received: 1         Beighbouring resident -       Down of the Development Application process allows the Plann Department to assess development proposals that seen restrictions.       Officer Comment:         The Development Application process allows the Action of th			forrod to	adioining				
Has a submission been received by Council?       √ Yes       No. received: 1         Summary of Objection:       No. received: 1         No. received: 1       Officer Comment:         The Development Application process allows the Plann property value. Others should be held to the same restrictions.       Officer Comment:         The Development Application policies to achieve a better outco tailored to their site, and this option is available to every in this instance, the proposal stable to every in this instance, the proposal has been assessed for its imp on the amenity of the streetscape and neighbour properties both at this time and when future development completed. The proposal satisfies the performance crite of the relevant LPP and LDP as detailed above.         Assessment of Application       is the land referred in the Heritage Inventory?       Yes       √ Yes       √ No         Are there any contributions applicable?       □ Yes       √ No       No       Recodes         Are Codes applicable?       □ Yes       √ No       No       Recodes         Are R Codes applicable?       □ Yes       √ No       No       Recodes         Building Height       Wall – 2.7m       √ Complies       □ Doesn't Comply         State the proposed building height       Wall – 2.7m       √ Complies       □ Doesn't Comply         Roof – 3.2m       Ves       □       The development Standards applicable and acequate provision been made for a cacess for th		neell le		aujuining	√ Yes	🗆 No	□ N/A	
Summary of Objection: Neighbouring resident - I built within the required restrictions to the detiment of my property value. Others should be held to the same restrictions.       Officer Comment: The Development Application process allows the Plant Department to assess development proposals that seed and local planning policies to achieve a better outco tailored to their site, and this option is available to everyo In this instance, the proponent has constructed II ancillary dwelling prior to the main dwelling which has turn, determined the most suitable location for outbuilding. The proposal satisfies the performance crite of the relevant LPP and LDP as detailed above.         Assessment of Application       If yes vi No         Are there any contributions applicable?       Yes vi No         Are there any compliance issues in relation to existing development?       Yes vi No         Are R Codes applicable?       Yes vi No         Building Height       Wall – 3.1m       Roof – 4.2m         Scheme / Policy Requirement Provisions of the officer       Vall – 2.7m       vi Complies in Doesn't Comply         Clause 67       In the opinion of the officer i. Are utility services available and adequate for the development?       The development?         In the opinion of the officer ii. Has adequate provision been made for access for the evelopment?       The development site is cleared land. the landscaping and protection for any trees or other vegetation on the land?         iii. Has adequate provision been made for access for the development or facilities by disabled persons?       N/A		eceived by	Council?		√ Yes	□ No	D N/A	
Neighbouring resident -         I built within the required restrictions to the detriment of my property value. Others should be held to the same restrictions.       The Development Application process allows the Planning policies to achieve a better outcomplete detribution is available to every and local planning policies to achieve a better outcomplete detribution is available to every in this instance, the proponent has constructed it ancillary dwelling prior to the main dwelling which has turn, determined the most suitable location for outbuilding. The proposal has been assessed for its imp on the amenity of the streetscape and neighbour properties both at this time and when future development completed. The proposal satisfies the performance crite of the relevant LPP and LDP as detailed above.         Assessment of Application       Is the land referred in the Heritage Inventory?       □ Yes √ No         Are there any compliance issues in relation to existing development?       □ Yes √ No         R codes       □ Yes √ No         Are the development Standards (Schedule 9)       √ No         Are the development Standards applicable?       □ Yes √ No         Building Height       Wall – 3.1m       Roof – 4.2m         State the proposed building height       Wall – 2.7m       √ Complies □ Doesn't Comply         Provisions of the Scheme?       Officer Comment       Yes         In the opinion of the officer       Yes       The development site is cleared land.         i. Are utility services available and adequate provision been made for the landscaping and protection								
Is the land referred in the Heritage Inventory?       □ Yes       √ No         Are there any Contributions applicable?       □ Yes       √ No         Are there any compliance issues in relation to existing development?       □ Yes       √ No         R Codes       □ Yes       √ No         Are R Codes applicable?       □ Yes       √ No         Development Standards (Schedule 9)       □ Yes       √ No         Are the development Standards applicable?       □ Yes       √ No         Building Height       Wall - 3.1m       Roof - 4.2m         State the proposed building height       Wall - 2.7m       √ Complies       □ Doesn't Comply         Roof - 3.2m       √ Complies       □ Doesn't Comply       Clause 67         In the opinion of the officer, would approval of the planning consent be appropriate under Clause 67 of the Deen Provisions of the Scheme?       Yes         Officer Comment       Yes       The development site is cleared land.         ii. Has adequate provision been made for the landscaping and protection for any trees or other vegetation on the land?       The development site is cleared land.         iii. Has adequate provision been made for access for the development or facilities by disabled persons?       N/A	I built within the required property value. Others	restrictions			Department vary the de and local p tailored to th In this inst ancillary dw turn, deten outbuilding. on the am properties b completed.	to assess d emed-to-con lanning poli beir site, and tance, the relling prior mined the The proposi- oth at this tin The proposi-	levelopment proposals that see mply requirements of the RCC cies to achieve a better outco this option is available to every proponent has constructed to the main dwelling which has most suitable location for al has been assessed for its im the streetscape and neighbour me and when future development al satisfies the performance critical critical construction of the streets the street of the	ek to odes ome one. their as in the pact uring ent is
Is the land referred in the Heritage Inventory?       □ Yes       √ No         Are there any Contributions applicable?       □ Yes       √ No         Are there any compliance issues in relation to existing development?       □ Yes       √ No         R Codes       □ Yes       √ No         Are R Codes applicable?       □ Yes       √ No         Development Standards (Schedule 9)       □ Yes       √ No         Are the development Standards applicable?       □ Yes       √ No         Building Height       Wall – 3.1m       Roof – 4.2m         State the proposed building height       Wall – 2.7m       √ Complies       □ Doesn't Comply         Roof – 3.2m       ✓ Complies       □ Doesn't Comply       Clause 67         In the opinion of the officer, would approval of the planning consent be appropriate under Clause 67 of the Deen Provisions of the Scheme?       Yes         Officer Comment       Yes       The development site is cleared land.         ii. Has adequate provision been made for the landscaping and protection for any trees or other vegetation on the land?       The development site is cleared land.         iii. Has adequate provision been made for access for the development or facilities by disabled persons?       N/A	Assessment of Applica	tion						
Are there any Contributions applicable?       □ Yes       √ No         Are there any compliance issues in relation to existing development?       □ Yes       √ No         R Codes       □ Yes       √ No         Are R Codes applicable?       □ Yes       √ No         Development Standards (Schedule 9)       Are the development Standards applicable?       □ Yes       √ No         Building Height       Scheme / Policy Requirement       Wall – 3.1m       Roof – 4.2m         State the proposed building height       Wall – 2.7m       √ Complies       □ Doesn't Comply         Roof – 3.2m       ✓ Complies       □ Doesn't Comply       Provisions of the officer, would approval of the planning consent be appropriate under Clause 67 of the Deen Provisions of the Scheme?         Officer Comment       Yes			ventory?			□ Yes	√ No	
Are there any compliance issues in relation to existing development?       □ Yes       √ No         R Codes       □ Yes       √ No         Are R Codes applicable?       □ Yes       √ No         Development Standards (Schedule 9)       □ Yes       √ No         Are the development Standards applicable?       □ Yes       √ No         Building Height       Scheme / Policy Requirement       Wall – 3.1m       Roof – 4.2m         State the proposed building height       Wall – 2.7m       √ Complies       □ Doesn't Comply         Roof – 3.2m       ✓ Complies       □ Doesn't Comply         Clause 67       In the opinion of the officer, would approval of the planning consent be appropriate under Clause 67 of the Deen Provisions of the Scheme?         Officer Comment       Yes         In the opinion of the officer       Yes         ii. Are utility services available and adequate for the development?       The development site is cleared land.         iii. Has adequate provision been made for the landscaping and protection for any trees or other vegetation on the land?       N/A         iiii. Has adequate provision been made for access for the development or facilities by disabled persons?       N/A			-					
R Codes       Are R Codes applicable?       □ Yes √ No         Development Standards (Schedule 9)       Are the development Standards applicable?       □ Yes √ No         Building Height       Scheme / Policy Requirement       Wall – 3.1m       Roof – 4.2m         State the proposed building height       Wall – 2.7m       √ Complies       □ Doesn't Comply         Roof – 3.2m       √ Complies       □ Doesn't Comply         Clause 67       In the opinion of the officer, would approval of the planning consent be appropriate under Clause 67 of the Deen Provisions of the Scheme?         Officer Comment       Yes         In the opinion of the officer       Yes         ii. Are utility services available and adequate for the development?       Yes         iii. Has adequate provision been made for the landscaping and protection for any trees or other vegetation on the land?       The development site is cleared land.         iii. Has adequate provision been made for access for the development of facilities by disabled persons?       N/A				existing develo	opment?			
Are R Codes applicable?       □ Yes √No         Development Standards (Schedule 9)       Are the development Standards applicable?       □ Yes √No         Building Height       □ Yes √No         Scheme / Policy Requirement       Wall – 3.1m       Roof – 4.2m         State the proposed building height       Wall – 2.7m       √ Complies       □ Doesn't Comply         Roof – 3.2m       √ Complies       □ Doesn't Comply         Clause 67         In the opinion of the officer, would approval of the planning consent be appropriate under Clause 67 of the Deen Provisions of the Scheme?         Officer Comment       Yes         i. Are utility services available and adequate for the development?       Yes         ii. Has adequate provision been made for the landscaping and protection for any trees or other vegetation on the land?       The development site is cleared land.         iii. Has adequate provision been made for access for the development of facilities by disabled persons?       N/A	· · ·				•			
Development Standards (Schedule 9)         Are the development Standards applicable?       □ Yes         Are the development Standards applicable?       □ Yes         Scheme / Policy Requirement       Wall – 3.1m         Scheme / Policy Requirement       Wall – 3.1m         State the proposed building height       Wall – 2.7m         V Complies       □ Doesn't Comply         Roof – 3.2m       √ Complies         Clause 67       In the opinion of the officer, would approval of the planning consent be appropriate under Clause 67 of the Deen         Provisions of the Scheme?       Yes         Officer Comment       Yes         i. Are utility services available and adequate for the development?       Yes         ii. Has adequate provision been made for the landscaping and protection for any trees or other vegetation on the land?       The development site is cleared land.         iii. Has adequate provision been made for access for the development or facilities by disabled persons?       N/A	Are R Codes applicable?				□ Yes	√ No		
Building Height       Wall – 3.1m       Roof – 4.2m         State the proposed building height       Wall – 2.7m       √ Complies       Doesn't Comply         State the proposed building height       Wall – 2.7m       √ Complies       Doesn't Comply         Clause 67       In the opinion of the officer, would approval of the planning consent be appropriate under Clause 67 of the Deen         Provisions of the Scheme?       Yes         In the opinion of the officer       Yes         i. Are utility services available and adequate for the development?       Yes         ii. Has adequate provision been made for the landscaping and protection for any trees or other vegetation on the land?       The development site is cleared land.         iii. Has adequate provision been made for access for the development or facilities by disabled persons?       N/A								
Scheme / Policy Requirement       Wall – 3.1m       Roof – 4.2m         State the proposed building height       Wall – 2.7m       √ Complies       Doesn't Comply         Roof – 3.2m       ✓ Complies       □ Doesn't Comply         Clause 67         In the opinion of the officer, would approval of the planning consent be appropriate under Clause 67 of the Deen         Provisions of the Scheme?       Yes         Officer Comment       Yes         i. Are utility services available and adequate for the development?       Yes         ii. Has adequate provision been made for the landscaping and protection for any trees or other vegetation on the land?       The development site is cleared land.         iii. Has adequate provision been made for access for the development or facilities by disabled persons?       N/A		ndards app	licable?	□ Ye	s	$\sqrt{N}$	0	
State the proposed building height       Wall – 2.7m Roof – 3.2m       √ Complies       □ Doesn't Comply         Clause 67         In the opinion of the officer, would approval of the planning consent be appropriate under Clause 67 of the Deen Provisions of the Scheme?         Officer Comment         Yes         In the opinion of the officer         In the opinion of the officer         i.       Are utility services available and adequate for the development?       Yes         ii.       Has adequate provision been made for the landscaping and protection for any trees or other vegetation on the land?       The development site is cleared land.         iii.       Has adequate provision been made for access for the development or facilities by disabled persons?       N/A		·			<u> </u>	1.0		
Clause 67       In the opinion of the officer, would approval of the planning consent be appropriate under Clause 67 of the Deen Provisions of the Scheme?         Officer Comment       Yes         In the opinion of the officer       Yes         In the opinion of the officer       Yes         i. Are utility services available and adequate for the development?       Yes         ii. Has adequate provision been made for the landscaping and protection for any trees or other vegetation on the land?       The development site is cleared land.         iii. Has adequate provision been made for access for the development or facilities by disabled persons?       N/A					Root –	4.2m		
Roof – 3.2m         Clause 67         In the opinion of the officer, would approval of the planning consent be appropriate under Clause 67 of the Deen Provisions of the Scheme?         Officer Comment       Yes         In the opinion of the officer         i.       Are utility services available and adequate for the development?         ii.       Has adequate provision been made for the landscaping and protection for any trees or other vegetation on the land?       The development site is cleared land.         iii.       Has adequate provision been made for access for the development or facilities by disabled persons?       N/A	State the proposed build	ng neight	vvali – 2	. / 111		s	esn't Comply	
Clause 67         In the opinion of the officer, would approval of the planning consent be appropriate under Clause 67 of the Deen Provisions of the Scheme?         Officer Comment       Yes         In the opinion of the officer         i.       Are utility services available and adequate for the development?         iii.       Has adequate provision been made for the landscaping and protection for any trees or other vegetation on the land?         iiii.       Has adequate provision been made for the landscaping and protection for any trees or other vegetation on the land?         iiii.       Has adequate provision been made for access for the development or facilities by disabled persons?			Roof – 3	3.2m			Son Comply	
Provisions of the Scheme?         Officer Comment       Yes         In the opinion of the officer       In the opinion of the officer         i. Are utility services available and adequate for the development?       Yes         ii. Has adequate provision been made for the landscaping and protection for any trees or other vegetation on the land?       The development site is cleared land.         iii. Has adequate provision been made for access for the development or facilities by disabled persons?       N/A								
Yes         In the opinion of the officer         i. Are utility services available and adequate for the development?       Yes         ii. Has adequate provision been made for the landscaping and protection for any trees or other vegetation on the land?       The development site is cleared land.         iii. Has adequate provision been made for access for the development or facilities by disabled persons?       N/A	Provisions of the Scheme		approval	of the plannin	g consent be	appropriate	e under Clause 67 of the Dee	med
i. Are utility services available and adequate for the development?       Yes         ii. Has adequate provision been made for the landscaping and protection for any trees or other vegetation on the land?       The development site is cleared land.         iii. Has adequate provision been made for the landscaping and protection for any trees or other vegetation on the land?       N/A         iii. Has adequate provision been made for access for the development or facilities by disabled persons?       N/A	Officer Comment	Yes						
i. Are utility services available and adequate for the development?       Yes         ii. Has adequate provision been made for the landscaping and protection for any trees or other vegetation on the land?       The development site is cleared land.         iii. Has adequate provision been made for the landscaping and protection for any trees or other vegetation on the land?       N/A         iii. Has adequate provision been made for access for the development or facilities by disabled persons?       N/A	In the opinion of the off	icer						
<ul> <li>ii. Has adequate provision been made for the landscaping and protection for any trees or other vegetation on the land?</li> <li>iii. Has adequate provision been made for access for the development or facilities by disabled persons?</li> </ul>	i. Are utility servio	es availa		Yes				
iii. Has adequate provision been made for access for the development or facilities by disabled persons?	ii. Has adequate prov the landscaping an	ision been d protection	made for n for any	The develop	oment site is c	leared land.		
	iii. Has adequate prov access for the deve	ision been elopment oi	made for	N/A				
to the existing and likely future amenity of the neighbourhood?	iv. Is development like to the existing and	ly to cause likely future		No				

v. Is the development likely to comply with Yes AS3959 at the building permit stage?				
Other Comments				
Any further comments in	relation to the applica	tion?		
Officer Comment	Approve Subject to 0	Conditions		

#### OFFICER RECOMMENDATION

That the Coordinator Planning Services Grant Planning Consent under Delegated Authority Instrument No. 34 pursuant to Clause 68(2) of the Deemed Provisions of Local Planning Scheme No. 1 for the proposed Outbuilding – Shed at 5 (Lot 20) Tallwood Loop Witchcliffe subject to compliance with the following conditions:

#### CONDITIONS

1. The development is to be carried out in compliance with the plans and documentation listed below and endorsed with Council's stamp, except where amended by other conditions of this consent.

Plans and Specifications	P1 – P3 received by the Shire on 14 <sup>th</sup> September 2023
-----------------------------	--

- 2. If the development, the subject of this approval, is not substantially commenced within two (2) years from the date of this letter, the approval shall lapse and be of no further effect. Where an approval has lapsed, development is prohibited without further approval being obtained.
- 3. The outbuilding(s) shall be used solely for purposes incidental and ancillary to the authorised use of the land.
- 4. The outbuilding shall not be used for human habitation.
- 5. The walls and roof of the building shall be clad in a non-reflective material and painted in a colour of natural or earth toning consistent with the existing landscape and existing development. To this end, reflective materials or reflective colours as cladding/external (including but not limited to) 'silver' sheeting painting white, cream, off white or pale grey are prohibited.
- 6. At all times, all stormwater and drainage run-off from the development shall be detained within the lot boundaries and managed to predevelopment flow regimes and/or disposed offsite by an approved connection to the Shire's drainage system in accordance with the Shire of Augusta Margaret River's Standards & Specifications.

## **ADVICE NOTES**

- a) You are advised of the need to comply with the requirements of the following other legislation:
  - (i) This is not a Building Permit. A Building Permit must be issued by the relevant Permit Authority before any work commences on site as per the *Building Act 2011*;
  - (ii) *Health (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1911* and Department requirements in respect to the development and use of the premises; and
  - (iii) The Bush Fires Act 1954 as amended, Section 33(3), Annual Bush Fires Notice applies to this property.
- b) In relation to condition 5, colourbond colours which have a solar absorbtance of less than 0.4 are 'Dover White', 'Surfmist', 'Classic Cream', 'Whitehaven', 'Cosmic' and 'Southerly'. Use of these colours does not meet condition 5.