

**Proposed Modification To Structure Plan - Forrestfield Urban Area U7- Lots 816-822 & Lot 9000
Mangosteen Drive
(PG-TPS-002/166) (Planning and Development Services)**

Submission	Details	Comments
1. B Wettstein 250 Sultana Road East Forrestfield WA 6058	Objection 1. Higher density development will increase traffic volumes and access should be provided from both Mangosteen Drive and Quince Lane to alleviate this issue. 2. The zoning should remain R20 because the original ODP has assigned pockets of R30 as the highest density for the area.	1. An Engineering Assessment Report was prepared by McDowall Affleck Consulting Engineers and confirms that most services to the subject land have sufficient capacity to cater for increased density. It allows for further changes at the design stage. 2. This proposal is to amend the original Outline Development Plan (ODP) and therefore allow for higher density to the currently adopted ODP.
2. JM Glisenti 228 Sultana Road East Forrestfield WA 6058	Objection 1. The built form that will result from the proposal will not be conducive to this area of Forrestfield.	1. Future development of land within the proposed structure plan can be subject to design guidelines which will result in a high quality built form and residential amenity.
3. RM Pollard 256 Sultana Road East Forrestfield WA 6058	Non objection	Noted
4. B & DJ Downing 234 Sultana Road East	Objection 1. The proposal will set a	1. The Shire of Kalamunda is required under the State Government endorsed

Shire of Kalamunda

<p>Forrestfield WA 6058</p>	<p>precedent of higher density in the area.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. The Planning Services Committee meeting on 10th October, 2005, recommended the adoption of the ODP for lots 10-17 Sultana Road with exception of the R30 zoned lot 14. Comment 10 stated "...The R30 on Lot 14 is not supported as it is somewhat ad hoc, would be inconsistent with the surrounding grid pattern lot layout and would not represent the best planning outcome for the overall area." The comments made by council are no less relevant to the R40 proposal. 3. The R40 zoning is out of character. 4. R40 densities are suitable for areas closer to public transport, shopping and community infrastructure nodes and corridors. The closest bus stop is 650m away and the closest shopping centre is 3 km away. 5. Traffic movements will be increased. 	<p>strategic plan Directions 2031 and Network City to accommodate additional population through identifying areas that area suited to increased density. The subject land is seen to be suitable for increased density.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. In the 4 years since the original adoption of the Outline Development Plan, a number of R30 and R40 sites have been developed in the Forrestfield Urban Area and the proposal is now seen to be suitable for the area. 3. Within the Forrestfield urban area, a number of R30 and R40 sites have been developed or approved. 4. The proposal is consistent with the provisions of Liveable Neighbourhoods with respect to public transport, shopping and community infrastructure. 5. An Engineering Assessment Report was prepared by McDowall Affleck Consulting Engineers and confirms that most services to the subject land have sufficient
-----------------------------	---	--

		<p>6. Safety issues will arise without an upgrade of Sultana Road East.</p> <p>7. The proposal makes no provision for visitor parking with exception of the 4 visitor bay for the 13 rear units on Quince Lane.</p> <p>8. The narrow width of Mangosteen Drive, servicing 10 lots, does not provide sufficient parking and the footpaths will become parking spaces.</p> <p>9. Safety might be compromised during an emergency as there is no alternative pedestrian access to the rear units on Quince Lane other than the one shown on the proposal.</p> <p>10. Does not appear to meet the WAPC guidelines that require a 4 m vehicle access way and a separate 1.2 m pedestrian access path.</p> <p>11. Rubbish collection vehicles will need to reverse the full length of Mangosteen Drive to collect bins, which is undesirable and unsafe.</p> <p>12. On recycle collection days, 56 bins will potentially be placed on the verge and 32 bins will be clustered at the end of Quince Lane. This</p>	<p>capacity to cater for increased density. It allows for further changes at the design stage.</p> <p>6. Noted</p> <p>7. This issue can be addressed at development stage.</p> <p>8. This issue can be addressed at development stage.</p> <p>9. The whole development will have to be done in accordance with the Acceptable Development provisions of the Residential Design Codes at the Development approval stage.</p> <p>10. This issue can be addressed at development stage.</p> <p>11. The Detailed Area Plan that is being referred to is purely conceptual. All vehicle access and pedestrian ways will be dealt with at the time of development.</p> <p>12. This issue will be dealt with at the stage of subdivision and development.</p>
--	--	---	--

		<p>will result in negative amenity of the area.</p> <p>13. Privacy of Lot 16 will be affected by the facing units at the west end of Mangosteen Drive. Second storey habitable spaces of the proposal will visually intrude into lot 16.</p>	<p>13. The whole development will have to be done in accordance with the Acceptable Development provisions of the Residential Design Codes at the Development approval stage. Privacy issues are addressed under the RD Codes.</p>
--	--	--	--

Copies of submissions may be made available to Councillors.