DEVELOPMENT ASSESSMENT REPORT Shire of Augusta Margaret River 17 August to 23 August 2023

APPLICATIONS RECEIVED

Date Rec'd	Reference No.	Address	Proposal
PLANNING			
17/08/2023	P223526	Wallcliffe Road Reserve, Margaret River	EV Charging Station
17/08/2023	P223529	10439 (Lot 1499) Caves Road, Deepdene	Farm Shed
BUILDING			
17/08/2023	223409	341 (Lot 3135) Boodjidup Road, Margaret River	Carport and Patio
17/08/2023	223410	3 (Lot 602) Truffle Crct Cowaramup	Single Dwelling and Garage
18/08/2023	223411	67 (Lot 57) Bussell Highway, Cowaramup	Commercial Building 3 Shops and Ablutions Block
18/08/2023	223412	4 (Lot 20) Mopoke Place, Margaret River	Shed and Carport
21/08/2023	223413	612 (Lot 8) Redgate Road, Redgate	Detached Garage
21/08/2023	223414	4 (Lot 205) Flitch Road, Karridale	Single Dwelling
22/08/2023	223415	15 (Lot 352) Wise Road, Margaret River	Shed
22/08/2023	223416	7 (Lot 303) Logging Road, Karridale	Single Dwelling and Carport
22/08/2023	223417	41 and 103 (Lot 4) Wickham Road, Witchcliffe	Demolition of Dwelling, 2 Sheds and Dairy Building
22/08/2023	223418	8 (Lot 17) Stewart Smith Loop, Cowaramup	Single Dwelling, Garage, Patio and Retaining Wall
Exploration Lic	enses for Comme	nt	
Nil			

APPLICATIONS DETERMINED UNDER DELEGATION

Date Rec'd	Reference No.	Address	Proposal	Outcome
PLANNING				
26/06/2023	P223399	Unit 3/35 (Lot 3) Stewart Street, Margaret River	Holiday House Renewal	Approved
05/07/2023	P223420	38 (Lot 5) Elva Street Margaret, River	Ancillary Dwelling	Approved
SUBDIVISION	S			
07/07/2023	P223426	423 (Lot 2703) Sebbes Road, Forest Grove	Survey Strata	Further information required
11/07/2023	P223437	9 (Lot 19) Friesian Street, Cowaramup	Survey Strata	Supported subject to conditions
LOCAL LAW F	PERMITS			

LEVEL 3 PLANNING APPLICATIONS FOR DETERMINATION

Date Rec'd	Reference No.	Address	Proposal	Recommendation
PLANNING				
08/06/2023	P223346	330 (Lot 62) Kudardup Road, Kudardup	Outbuilding (Shed)	Supported subject to conditions
09/06/2023	P223349	24 (Lot 15) Samworth Street, Margaret River	Verandah Additions	Supported subject to 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 Single Dwelling (Outbuilding - Shed) 330 (Lot 62) Kudardup Road, Kudardup

P223346; PTY/13589

REPORTING OFFICER
DISCLOSURE OF INTEREST Suzi Magnall Nil

General Information	
Lot Area	2094m ²
Zone	Residential 'R5'
Proposed Development	The proposal includes a residential dwelling with ancillary dwelling, outbuilding and water tank on a Residential 'R5' lot.
	The fill / sand pad for the proposed residential dwelling extends into the 5m side setback by up to 1m, which is a variation to LPS1.
	The outbuilding proposes a wall / ridge height and floor area variation to LPP1 and the RCodes. The associated retaining (up to 1m high) for the outbuilding along the rear (western) boundary is a variation to the RCodes.
	The ancillary dwelling and water tank are compliant with all relevant policy requirements.
Permissible Use Class	Single House – P
Heritage/Aboriginal Sites	None Identified
Encumbrance	Notification x4 including —
Date Received	08/06/2023





Policy Requirements					
Is the land or proposal referred to in any Council Policy? $\sqrt{\text{Yes}}$ \square No					
If yes, state the Policy/Policie	Local Planning Scheme No.1 – Clause 4.21.2 (d)				
Officer Comment R2.5 and R5 code: (d) side boundary setbacks shall be 5 metres unless the local government, following consult with affected adjoining landowners, otherwise approves. Whilst the proposed dwelling is clear of the 5m setback, the extent of the sand pad and bar marginally encroaches into this area. There were no objections from neighbouring proper regarding this matter and the amount of development proposed is considered minor and decaptable.					
Is the land or proposal referred to in any Council Policy? √ Yes □ No					
If yes, state the Policy/Policie	Local Planning Policy No.1 'Outbuildings, Swimming Pools and Farm Buildings				

Officer Comment

The proposed Outbuilding presents variations to the Shire's LPP1, by way of wall height, ridge height and floor area. The proposed variations are considered below:

AD1.2 - Outbuilding wall height does not exceed 3.1m.

The original plans proposed a lower height from NGL on the southern wall, however the close proximity to the boundary was a cause for concern. In the interests of achieving a better outcome for the neighbouring property, revised plans were submitted, relocating the water tank into the south western corner and moving the outbuilding further northwards along the rear boundary. The site is sloping from north to south and in order to create a flat pad for the outbuilding to be constructed, without any cut and retaining to the northern end, a 1m high retaining wall and site fill is required to the south. This results in an overall wall height of 4.6m from NGL to the south and 3.6m (with no retaining) on the northern elevation, which is significantly above the 3.1m Acceptable Development in LPP1. The increased side setback of 13m offsets the additional retaining proposed, and the siting of the water tank helps to mitigate the overall visual impact of this elevation. A vegetation screen along the south and western boundary has been included as a condition of development to soften the overall bulk and scale. The proposed variation in response to the natural slope of the site is considered acceptable.

AD1.3 – Outbuildings do not exceed a floor area of 80m2 (R5)

The floor area of the proposed outbuilding is 120m², presenting a variation of 40m² and requiring consideration against the Performance Criteria of LPP1 which allows outbuildings up to 120m² on R5 coded residential lots.

The outbuilding is substantial in its size, scale and bulk and the perceived impact on neighbours in the original location was considerable. The revised siting of the outbuilding 13m north of the boundary will ensure there is no impact on the ability for the neighbouring lot to access northern sunlight and will help ameliorate the potential visual impact. The water tank in the south western corner acts as a partial 'screen' to the outbuilding and breaks up the overall bulk of the elevation when viewed from the south. The addition of a vegetation screen will further soften the impact of the development.

The outbuilding is located behind the proposed dwelling and will be constructed from complimentary materials and colours. It is considered proportionally scaled with the other development that is proposed on the site and the perceived impact on the streetscape is minimal. The proposed variation is considered acceptable. AD1.4 Located behind the front of an existing dwelling The proposal includes a dwelling located towards the front of the site with the outbuilding being located behind the dwelling. The proposal is compliant. AD1.5 On properties coded R5, setbacks for outbuildings are to be in accordance with Table 2a and 2b The proposed outbuilding contains no major openings on the rear and southern elevations and is assessed against Table 2a. A 13m setback is proposed to the southern boundary which is compliant with the requirement of Table 2a. Due to the fall of the site from north to south, the required setback increases relative to the proposed wall height from NGL, from 1.6m to 1.8m. The development proposes a 1.6m setback along the western boundary, which is compliant at the northern end of the development where no retaining is proposed, but results in a minor variation at the southern end where the 1m retaining is at its highest. The proposed variation is in response to the natural slope of the site and in order to achieve a better outcome for the neighbouring property to the south, so is considered acceptable. Structure Plans and Local Development Plans (LDP's) Is the land in any Structure Plan Area or subject to a LDP? □ No If yes, state the Policy/Policies Kudardup Village Structure Plan **Officer Comment** No specifications relevant to the development **Planning History** N/A **Advertising/Agency Referrals** Has the application been referred to √ Yes □ No □ N/A landowners/agency? Has a submission been received by Council? √ Yes □ No □ N/A No. received: 1 **Details of Submission** Officer Comment The following concerns regarding the proposed outbuilding were raised by the neighbouring property to the south: - Too big - the size of a commercial unit on residential land Policy LPP1 allows outbuildings of up to 120m² on R5 - Too high – total gable height of 4.62 on our northern Residential lots when assessed against performance criteria. See above for justification. boundary - Too close to the boundary for its proposed height - The height of the building in close proximity to the boundary was - Will prevent direct sunlight over a substantial area of an initial cause for concern. Revised plans have been submitted our cultivated gardens and will cast shade in the and the building has been pushed further north away from this winter months when the sun angle is much lower boundary which ameliorates the impact on these neighbours. - The angled east / west boundary line between Lot Refer to assessment above. 62/63 effectively puts the proposed building 7.5m westwards perpendicular to the street boundary and will significantly impact our enjoyment of our north - The revised location is considered adequate to ensure the facing home and outdoor living space. neighbouring property has no loss of northern sunlight. - Elevated above natural ground level by 420mm plus an increased wall height. Being at the highest contour - The outbuilding is now a substantial distance from the shared of our land, then placed on a raised limestone block boundary that the impact on the neighbours will be minimal. Water wall will not be acceptable to us. tanks adjacent to the boundary are commonplace on R5 - Proposes a raised limestone wall to the South residential blocks and this will further mitigate the scale and bulk where rural fencing is installed of the outbuilding when viewed from the south. Proposed - Not shown as having a driveway access and no vegetation screening will also help soften the appearance of the screening has been indicated development. - Concerns regarding building colour and excessive noise and lighting in the foreground of the building - The retaining is in response to the natural slope of the site from north to south, and the requirement to create a flat slab for the building without any cutting in. Moving the outbuilding away from - If a building of appropriate dimensions was to be the boundary has increased the height of the proposed retaining, installed in a cut and retained position along the but the impact of this is offset by the 13m side setback achieved. Northern boundary of Lot 62, and the rain water tanks Refer to assessment above.

- Boundary fencing not affected by development.

Revised plans show driveway access and parking.

installed in the corner of Lot 62/63 boundary, the above objections would be considered to have been

mostly addressed.

		 The Applicant has justified their requirement for a shed of this size to suit existing vehicles and equipment. The shed will be ancillary to the residential use of the dwelling and will not cause undue noise and lighting over and above the residents enjoyment of their home. The site is not in a Visual Management Area so there are no restrictions regarding colour, however the Applicant has stated it will be complimentary to the site. Due to the concerns raised, the Applicant has moved the outbuilding further northwards away from the boundary and placed the water tank in the south west corner of the block. However, they have stated the floor level can't be cut in due to ongoing maintenance concerns with rainwater entering the proposed shed, hence why they are proposing to keep the floor level in line with the natural ground level on the higher end of the natural topography. This compromise is considered to mitigate the concerns raised by the neighbours and will ameliorate any perceived impacts from the outbuilding. 			
Assessment of Application					
Is the land referred in the Heritage	Inventory?		□Y	′es √No	
Are there any Contributions applica	ble?		ПΥ	′es √No	
Are there any compliance issues in	relation to existing of	development?	ΠY	′es √No	
R Codes					
Are R Codes applicable?			□ No		
Design Element	Policy / R Codes	Provided		Officer comment	
Front Setback	12m	12m		Complies	
Sides Setback	Dwelling: 5m	Dwelling: North – 5m		Complies	
	Jili	South – 5m		Compiles	
		Fill: <4m		Variation	
	Outbuilding:	Outbuilding:			
	Table 2a	North – 9m		Complies	
Rear Setback	Duralling	South – 13m			
Rear Selback	Dwelling: 6m	Dwelling: 28m		Complies	
	OIII	2011		Compiles	
	Outbuilding:	Outbuilding:			
	Table 2a	1.6m		Variation. See Officer Comment for	
	(1.6m/1.8m)			LPP1 above.	
Outdoor Living Area	m²	m²		O	
Open Space Requirement	70%	75%		Complies	
Upgrade Landscaping	√ Required			- Vegetation Condition Required	
Overlooking	□ Yes		No		
Street surveillance	√Yes		No		
Street Walls and Fences	☐ Yes		No		
Overshadowing	☐ Yes		No		
Other Variations	☐ Yes		No		
Officer's Comments against performance criteria				side setback required by LPS1 for sides of the dwelling.	
				n to south so a degree of fill is proposed	
				elf will not impinge on the side setback,	
				narginally encroach into this area over	
				the level of fill is relatively minor and	
				aspect of the development will harm the ain open space between dwellings.	
	STORAGE MICHIELDE	, policy, Willoll 10 to		Then share between awonings.	
Development Standards (Schedu	ile 9)				
Are the development Standards ap	□ Yes		√ No		
Car Parking					
LPS1 / R Codes Requirement	•	ired - 2 + 1 for	Car	Bays Proposed - Complies	
Duilding Hat 14 D	ancillary				
Scheme / Policy Pequirement	\\/all 7	n Boof O-	2		
Scheme / Policy Requirement State the proposed building height	Wall - 7r Wall – 3.45m	n Roof - 8m	1		
State the proposed building neight	vvaii – 3.43111	√ Complies	s	☐ Doesn't Comply	
	Roof – 5.8m	, complice	-		
Building Height - Outbuilding					
Scheme / Policy Requirement	Wall – 3	.1m Roof –	4.2m		

			,		
		.6m (from			
NGL		NGL)		□ Complies	√ Doesn't Comply
		D (-		- Compileo	(Boodi t Gompiy
Roof – 5			0 111 : 14	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
					equirement in LPP1. This has been
	assessed in the Officer Comment to			LPP1 above.	
	The proposed outbuilding ridge height measures 5.2m from NGL at its highest point and is a variation to the RCodes. The proposed variation is in response to the sloping site characteristics and the Applicant's requirement not to reduce the floor level below NGL at the northern elevation. The impact of the ridge height has been minimised by moving the outbuilding away from the southern boundary by 13m, thus ensuring there is no loss of sunlight to the neighbouring lot. The siting of the water tank in the south-western corner of the block will help reduce the overall impact of the outbuilding and the proposed screening will also soften the appearance of the development. The proposed design of the outbuilding is compatible with the scale of development on site and the setback behind the main dwelling ensures minimal impact on the streetscape. The proposed ridge will not have an undue impact on the neighbouring property and the variation is considered acceptable.				
Clause 67					
	ficer would	annroval o	of the planning	consent he anni	ropriate under Clause 67 of the Deemed
Provisions of the Schem		αρριοναι (or the planning	consent be appi	Tophate under Glause of of the Deemed
Officer Comment Yes					
In the opinion of the officer					
i. Are utility services available and			Yes		
adequate for the de					
ii. Has adequate prov					condition is proposed along the rear and
the landscaping a			southern bou	ndary of the outbu	uilding.
trees or other vege			N1/A		
iii. Has adequate prov			N/A		
access for the development or facilities by disabled persons?					
iv. Is development likely to cause detriment		No			
to the existing and likely future amenity		NO			
of the neighbourhood?					
v. Is the development likely to comply with		Yes			
AS3959 at the building permit stage?			. 55		
Other Comments					
Any further comments in relation to the application?					
Officer Comment			l is recommend	ded.	

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION

That the Acting 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 Single Dwelling (Outbuilding - Shed) at 330 (Lot 62) Kudardup Road, Kudardup 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 – P8 received by the Shire on 21/08/2023
-----------------------------	---

- 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. 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.
- 6. Prior to lodging of a building permit application, a Landscape Plan shall be prepared for the southern and western boundary of the property, as shown on approved plan 'P2', to the satisfaction of the Shire. The Landscape Plan shall be drawn to scale and show the following:

- a) The location, name and mature heights of existing vegetation being retained, proposed trees, shrubs and ground covers:
- b) Any natural landscaped areas to be retained; and
- c) Detail the timing of planting.
- 7. Landscaping shall be implemented, and maintained in accordance with the approved Landscape Plan
- 8. Prior to lodging of a building permit application, a schedule of colour and texture of the building materials shall be submitted and approved prior to the commencement of any work(s) and shall be implemented accordingly.

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.



DEVELOPMENT APPLICATION ASSESSMENT Report to Manager Planning and Regulatory Services

Proposed Verandah Additions 24 (Lot 15) Samworth Street, Margaret River

Level 3 – 1 x objection P223349; PTY/4596

REPORTING OFFICER : Tessa Ashworth

DISCLOSURE OF INTEREST : Nil

General Information	
Lot Area	2138m ²
Zone	R5
Proposed Development	Veranda addition to existing dwelling. Variation due to development 3.3m in lieu of
	5m side setback.
Permissible Use Class	'P' Single Dwelling
Heritage/Aboriginal Sites	None
Encumbrance	None
Date Received	09/06/2023





Policy Requirements					
Is the land or proposal referred to in any Council Policy?	☐ Yes	√ No			
Structure Plans and Local Development Plans (LDP's)					
Is the land in any Structure Plan Area or subject to a LDP?	☐ Yes	;	√ No		
Planning History					

1993 – Dwelling (P2126)					
2001– Outbuilding (P21071)					
2020 – Outbuilding additions and a	iterations (P220093)				
Advertising/Agency Referrals					
Has the application been r	eferred to adjoining	√Yes	□ No □ N/A		
landowners/agency?	. 0 :10				
Has a submission been received by	/ Council?	√ Yes No. received	□ No □ N/A		
Details of Submission		Officer Com			
1 x objection					
 The impacted side of the representation houses their master bedrown the development will cause traffic closer to their bedrown Noise emanating from the lack of sleep and nuisance. Ringtail Possum drey in transported. 	om and lounge room. se activity and foot om. veranda and resulting	scre neig wes outd	proponent has built an internal fence that eans their main outdoor area from the westerry phones. The extension of the veranda to the st shows no indication of being used as are door living area. There is no entry on the stern side of the dwelling.		
Addition may allow future wall of house out to edge of the second s		The 9m No add reta Ano requ	house near objecting neighbour. neighbour's bedroom window is approximately from the boundary. native vegetation to be removed for the ition. Peppermint tree to the northwest to be ined. Only planted garden beds will be affected other development application would be uired if room addition was to occur and be ject to neighbour submission.		
Assessment of Application					
Is the land referred in the Heritage			☐ Yes √ No		
Are there any Contributions applica			☐ Yes √ No		
Are there any compliance issues in	relation to existing devel	opment?	□ Yes √ No		
R Codes					
Are R Codes applicable?	Policy / P. Codes	√ Yes	Officer comment		
Design Element Front Setback	Policy / R Codes 12m	Provided 12m	Officer comment Complies		
			Veranda projects into front setback bu not included (5.1.2 - C2.4).		
Sides Setback	5m (LPS1)	3.3m	Variation		
Rear Setback	6m	37m	Complies		
Overlooking Street our will and	Yes		No		
Street surveillance	√Yes	□ No			
Street Walls and Fences Yes Voc					
Overshadowing Other Variations	☐ Yes √ No				
	☐ Yes	ν Ι	No		
Development Standards (Schedule 9) Are the development Standards applicable? □ Yes √ No					
Building Height	упоавіс :	US	Y INU		
Scheme / Policy Requirement	Wall - 7m	Roof - 8m	<u> </u>		
State the proposed building height	Wall – 2.4m	7,001 011			
		√ Complies	B □ Doesn't Comply		
Claves 67	Roof – 4.5m				
In the opinion of the officer would	d approval of the planning	ng consent ha	appropriate under Clause 67 of the Deemed		
Provisions of the Scheme?	approvar or the platifili	ng consent be	appropriate under Glause of Or the Deether		

Officer Comment	Veranda addition will replace ad hoc bull nose verandas at the front of the house. The 1.7m veranda will encompass west, north and east sides of the house. Keeping the 1.7m eave all the way around will provide design consistency and fits in with the pattern of development in the street. This is consistent with Clause 4.1.12 (c) in LPS1. The proponent was uninclined to shorten the eave and in reality will have very little difference to the outcome. It is reasonable to propose a veranda into the side setback given the lack of any eaves currently existing on the western side of the dwelling.			
In the opinion of the off	icer			
vi. Are utility services available and adequate for the development? vii. Has adequate provision been made for the landscaping and protection for any		Yes. No native vegetation impacted.		
viii. Has adequate provision been made for access for the development or facilities by disabled persons?		n/a		
ix. Is development likely to cause detriment to the existing and likely future amenity of the neighbourhood?		No		
x. Is the development AS3959 at the build	likely to comply with ing permit stage?	Yes		
Other Comments				
Any further comments in		tion?		
Officer Comment	No			

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION

That the Acting 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 Verandah Additions 24 (Lot 15) Samworth Street, Margaret River 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	Plans 1 & 2 received by the Shire 9 June 2023 Plan 3 received by the Shire 31 July 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.

ADVICE NOTES

- b) 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.