

**Response to Submissions Received  
Proposed Structure Plan Amendment – Lot 17 (228) Sultana Road East, Forrestfield**

Submitter No.	Nature of Submission	City's Response
<p align="center"><b>1.</b></p>	<p><b>Objection</b></p> <p>I am opposed to the proposal to increase the dwellings per hectare from 17 to 32. The increase in traffic alone, never mind the likely increase in crime is enough to warrant opposition. But the reason we bought into this area was for the land. For the feeling of country life, close to the city. Increase the dwelling capacity and you take that away from us. You take away our lifestyle. You take away our safety.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p><b>The potential for increased in traffic in the locality</b> The proposed rezoning has been amended to include an area of R25 as well as R20 and R40. This has reduced the possible increase in the number of dwellings from 15 to 10 dwellings per hectare. It is expected that the number of vehicle movements will be increased by a marginal number to what was originally considered in the Forrestfield U7 Structure Plan. In support of the amendment, a Traffic Engineering Report has been provided with the application. The report states the proposed changes to the Structure Plan will not have any negative impact to the surrounding network. The City's has reviewed the report and considers it is acceptable from a traffic engineering perspective. The existing and proposed future road network has capacity to accommodate the density increase.</p> <p><b>The potential for increased crime</b> Residential developments will be assessed in accordance with the Crime Prevention through Environmental Design (CPTED) Principles laden in the Residential Design Codes such as passive surveillance, access, and landscaping. Officers are satisfied that the proposed development is unlikely to increase crime if dwellings and developments are designed in accordance with the Residential Design Codes.</p> <p><b>The impact of an increased density on the amenity of the locality</b> The proposed Structure Plan Amendment is in accordance with the City's Local Planning Strategy and various State Government Strategic documents. Nonetheless, the City is committed to protecting surrounding residents from any potential impacts resulting from the proposed Structure Plan Amendment. Any issues relating to undue impacts upon surrounding landowners (i.e. privacy, overlooking, overshadowing, parking and traffic impacts) have been assessed or are more appropriately considered at subdivision and development stage.</p>
<p align="center"><b>2.</b></p>	<p><b>Objection</b></p>	<p>Noted.</p>

**Response to Submissions Received  
Proposed Structure Plan Amendment – Lot 17 (228) Sultana Road East, Forrestfield**

	<p>The housing planned does not fit in with the current design style of the surrounding and adjacent homes. The increased traffic is also destined to be a hazard through streets which have child care centres, schools and playgrounds. There are already many cars speeding along the current roads in place. This does not just affect residents but those that come to the area for activities such as the swimming club, equestrian club, child care amongst others There will also be less and less areas for children play and exercise in fielded areas close to home. The environmental impact around the surrounding crumpet creek reserve will also be affected with many species of birds and other fauna which have disappeared due to their loss of habitation and future further loss. The increased density will also see an increase in household pets such as cats which can further affect the local habitat by killing off local fauna and spreading disease. The increased density will also likely bring increased crime levels which are already climbing at an alarming rate in the Forrestfield area. In instance where the positive outweighs the negative an argument can be made however in this instance the negatives far outweigh the positives and decisions involving the local community need to be taken far more seriously as they are the voice of what happens on the ground and have a firsthand insight into how it is to live in the area.</p>	<p><b>Increased density being inconsistent with the surrounding area</b> The surrounding Residential development is predominately coded R20 with pockets of R12.5, R30 and R40. The proposed residential density of R20, R25 and R40 is considered in the similar band of low density. Officers acknowledge that there will be a different built form as dwelling density increases, but it will not be to an extent that is inconsistent with the surrounding area.</p> <p><b>Traffic Hazard</b> There are no schools or established child care centres within proximity of the site. The increase in traffic would not result in any major changes to amenity. The closest local centre and school are more than 500m away from the site.</p> <p><b>Environmental Impact</b> Crumpet Creek is approximately 250m from the subject site. The proposed increase in density is not seen to affect the existing creek line. Efforts to retain any remnant vegetation on site can be dealt with at the subdivision phase through the submission of a Local Development Plan.</p> <p><b>Loss of Open Space Areas</b> There are currently four public open space reservations within a 400m radius of the proposal.</p> <p><b>The potential for increased crime</b> Residential developments will be assessed in accordance with the Crime Prevention through Environmental Design (CPTED) Principles laden in the Residential Design Codes such as passive surveillance, access, and landscaping. Officers are satisfied that the proposed development is unlikely to increase crime if dwellings and developments are designed in accordance with the Residential Design Codes.</p>
<p align="center"><b>3.</b></p>	<p><b>Objection</b></p> <p>This high-density housing does not suit the surrounding properties. Many young families in the area. The lot sizes in the hales was a bit extreme for the surrounding residents and this takes it even denser. People move to the city of Kalamunda to get away from busy roads and congestion. Too much too soon. Unnecessary and greedy</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p><b>Increased density being inconsistent with the surrounding area</b> The surrounding Residential development is predominately coded R20 with pockets of R12.5, R30 and R40. The proposed residential density of R20, R25 and R40 is considered in the similar band of low density. Officers acknowledge that there will be a different built form as dwelling</p>

**Response to Submissions Received  
Proposed Structure Plan Amendment – Lot 17 (228) Sultana Road East, Forrestfield**

		<p>density increases, but it will not be to an extent that is inconsistent with the surrounding area.</p> <p><b>The impact of an increased density on the amenity of the locality</b> The proposed Structure Plan Amendment is in accordance with the City's Local Planning Strategy and various State Government Strategic documents. Nonetheless, the City is committed to protecting surrounding residents from any potential impacts resulting from the proposed Structure Plan Amendment. Any issues relating to undue impacts upon surrounding landowners (i.e. privacy, overlooking, overshadowing, parking and traffic impacts) have been assessed or are more appropriately considered at subdivision and development stage.</p>
4.	<p><b>Objection</b></p> <p>Re zoning should not be allowed, I would suggest that you drive around the Hales many properties don't have enough room to park their vehicles within their property boundaries now on the larger blocks, all you are creating will be more social issues with increased population within a smaller area, The Hales already looks untidy and congested. It's a shame that these new developments you won't have room to plant a tree in a suburb that has Forrest with its name</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p><b>The impact of an increased density on the amenity of the locality</b> The proposed Structure Plan Amendment is in accordance with the City's Local Planning Strategy and various State Government Strategic documents. Nonetheless, the City is committed to protecting surrounding residents from any potential impacts resulting from the proposed Structure Plan Amendment. Any issues relating to undue impacts upon surrounding landowners (i.e. privacy, overlooking, overshadowing, parking and traffic impacts) have been assessed or are more appropriately considered at subdivision and development stage</p> <p><b>Changes to Existing Built Form</b> No housing designs have been submitted at this stage for the proposed subdivision layout. It is recommended that a Local Development Plan is to be created in order to produce high quality housing stock with the amended subdivision layout and to supplement nearby housing designs. The provision of parking facilities within each will be assessed at this detailed design phase.</p>
5.	<p><b>Objection</b></p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p><b>Changes to Existing Built Form</b></p>

**Response to Submissions Received  
Proposed Structure Plan Amendment – Lot 17 (228) Sultana Road East, Forrestfield**

	<p>I am strongly against the proposed high-density development over my back fence for the following reasons; -proposed blocks are very small, obviously multi story town house type dwellings will be built, I don't wish to have 3 or 4 ,2 story townhouses being able to see into my backyard, view over my family in the swimming pool and view into the rear windows of our house and viewing our underwear on the clothes line. -this proposal would see minimum 60 more cars plus visitors down our little street, which wasn't designed with high volume in mind and would be a danger to my young children. -these blocks will undoubtedly attract investors, not owner occupiers. In turn, this will mean there will be nearly all renters, which will create a "slum" next door to my house. -Aforementioned slum will devalue my property significantly. -will increase the burden on our infrastructure, in particular, the local schools. I sincerely hope you will take my viewpoints in mind when considering approving this proposal.</p>	<p>No housing designs have been submitted at this stage for the proposed subdivision layout. It is recommended that a Local Development Plan is to be created in order to produce high quality housing stock with the amended subdivision layout and to supplement nearby housing designs. The provision of parking facilities within each will be assessed at this detailed design phase.</p> <p><b>The potential for increased in traffic in the locality</b> The proposed rezoning has been amended to include an area of R25 as well as R20 and R40. This has reduced the possible increase in the number of dwellings from 15 to 10 dwellings per hectare. It is expected that the number of vehicle movements will be increased by a marginal number to what was originally considered in the Forrestfield U7 Structure Plan. In support of the amendment, a Traffic Engineering Report has been provided with the application. The report states the proposed changes to the Structure Plan will not have any negative impact to the surrounding network. The City's has reviewed the report and considers it is acceptable from a traffic engineering perspective. The existing and proposed future road network has capacity to accommodate the density increase.</p>
<p><b>6.</b></p>	<p><b>Objection</b></p> <p>Do not agree to amendment on Lot 17 (228) Sultana Rd East Forrestfield WA, it will turn area into an overcrowded traffic congested, slum put it in your backyard not, mine</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p><b>The potential for increased in traffic in the locality</b> The proposed rezoning has been amended to include an area of R25 as well as R20 and R40. This has reduced the possible increase in the number of dwellings from 15 to 10 dwellings per hectare. It is expected that the number of vehicle movements will be increased by a marginal number to what was originally considered in the Forrestfield U7 Structure Plan. In support of the amendment, a Traffic Engineering Report has been provided with the application. The report states the proposed changes to the Structure Plan will not have any negative impact to the surrounding network. The City's has reviewed the report and considers it is acceptable from a traffic engineering perspective. The existing and proposed future road network has capacity to accommodate the density increase.</p>
<p><b>7.</b></p>	<p><b>Objection</b></p> <p>Re the Forrestfield development amendment for Lot17 Sultana Rd. I most strongly object to breaking the lot into such small</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p><b>The impact of an increased density on the amenity of the locality</b>The proposed Structure Plan Amendment is in accordance with the City's</p>

**Response to Submissions Received  
Proposed Structure Plan Amendment – Lot 17 (228) Sultana Road East, Forrestfield**

	<p>building blocks. It is totally unfair to the people who bought and built their homes under the current guidelines. I have a child living in Forrestfield and her in-laws also live there and it is unfair to treat it as the Kalamunda “poor relation”.</p>	<p>Local Planning Strategy and various State Government Strategic documents. Nonetheless, the City is committed to protecting surrounding residents from any potential impacts resulting from the proposed Structure Plan Amendment. Any issues relating to undue impacts upon surrounding landowners (i.e. privacy, overlooking, overshadowing, parking and traffic impacts) have been assessed or are more appropriately considered at subdivision and development stage.</p>
8.	<p><b>Objection</b></p> <p>The new proposed development of small blocks off Sultana Road East is very bad for the area. This will inevitably lead to very small homes, most affordable for the low socio-economic population. Housing on blocks this small leads to conflict amongst neighbours. We already have a lot of anti-social behaviour in the area. We really don't need any more problems. If you take a look on the Forrestfield and surrounds Facebook page, you will see from the posts, security and peaceful living here in the 'fruit bowl' has already declined. Please reconsider the decision to rezone the blocks to even smaller size. I am very concerned as I live alone, my security and peace of mind is being threatened.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p><b>The potential for increased crime</b> Residential developments will be assessed in accordance with the Crime Prevention through Environmental Design (CPTED) Principles laden in the Residential Design Codes such as passive surveillance, access, and landscaping. Officers are satisfied that the proposed development is unlikely to increase crime if dwellings and developments are designed in accordance with the Residential Design Codes.</p>
9.	<p><b>Non-objection – Water Corporation</b></p> <p>Thank you for your letter regarding the above Minor Amendment to Structure Plan. The Corporation broadly agrees with the overall water and wastewater servicing strategy outlined in the servicing report and will await a more detailed water and wastewater reticulation plan prepared by the proponent's engineers at the subdivision stage to finalise servicing needs for the various sites and density increases outlined.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
10.	<p><b>Objection</b></p> <p>I wish to lodge my objection the above amendment. This proposal will increase traffic along Gala Way and Seville Road dramatically. These roadways are very narrow and often congested with cars parked at the Park. As there is no parking</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p><b>The potential for increased in traffic in the locality</b> The proposed rezoning has been amended to include an area of R25 as well as R20 and R40. This has reduced the possible increase in the number of dwellings from 15 to 10 dwellings per hectare. It is expected</p>

**Response to Submissions Received  
Proposed Structure Plan Amendment – Lot 17 (228) Sultana Road East, Forrestfield**

	<p>at the park and the verge is too high to park cars on they are parked on mainly Seville Road making it single file access. The increased traffic will be hazardous to the many children that currently play at the park every day. I chose to buy in the area for the large blocks in the area with trees, bird life, animals that give the area a rural feel. This development of smaller block sizing will force people to build two storey houses to give them increased floor area. The people who have properties bordering this subdivision will be greatly impacted with multiple high storey houses blocking their privacy, light and sun hours. This type of subdivision should be for new larger developments in city areas not semi-rural. Hoping this subdivision does not proceed.</p>	<p>that the number of vehicle movements will be increased by a marginal number to what was originally considered in the Forrestfield U7 Structure Plan. In support of the amendment, a Traffic Engineering Report has been provided with the application. The report states the proposed changes to the Structure Plan will not have any negative impact to the surrounding network. The City's has reviewed the report and considers it is acceptable from a traffic engineering perspective. The existing and proposed future road network has capacity to accommodate the density increase.</p> <p><b>The impact of an increased density on the amenity of the locality</b> The proposed Structure Plan Amendment is in accordance with the City's Local Planning Strategy and various State Government Strategic documents. Nonetheless, the City is committed to protecting surrounding residents from any potential impacts resulting from the proposed Structure Plan Amendment. Any issues relating to undue impacts upon surrounding landowners (i.e. privacy, overlooking, overshadowing, parking and traffic impacts) have been assessed or are more appropriately considered at subdivision and development stage.</p> <p><b>Changes to Existing Built Form</b> Although the proposed lot sizes may warrant the consideration of Town Housing Development, it is not guaranteed as part of this structure plan amendment. Any dwelling proposed is subject to an assessment against the visual privacy provisions outlined in the Residential Design Codes.</p>
<p>11.</p>	<p><b>Objection</b></p> <p>I object to the proposed block sizes abutting Sultana Road East. The size should create a buffer to buildings behind and the rural area nearby. There is an existing buffer and it should be in-line with it to be fair with neighbouring properties. It should be around 2 or 3 blocks maximum for the buffer at R12.5. I spoke to Callum at the City's Council Office and I appreciate discussing the proposal.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p><b>Increased density being inconsistent with the surrounding area</b> The surrounding Residential development is predominately coded R20 with pockets of R12.5, R30 and R40. The proposed residential density of R20, R25 and R40 is considered in the similar band of low density. Officers acknowledge that there will be a different built form as dwelling density increases, but it will not be to an extent that is inconsistent with the surrounding area.</p>
<p>12.</p>	<p><b>Objection</b></p>	<p>Noted.</p>

**Response to Submissions Received  
Proposed Structure Plan Amendment – Lot 17 (228) Sultana Road East, Forrestfield**

	The block sizes are ridiculously small. It's not good for anyone to live like that. No backyard, no trees & no room for pets. If this was to be approved it would allow for even smaller blocks to be considered. Where does it end.	<b>Increased density being inconsistent with the surrounding area</b> The surrounding Residential development is predominately coded R20 with pockets of R12.5, R30 and R40. The proposed residential density of R20, R25 and R40 is considered in the similar band of low density. Officers acknowledge that there will be a different built form as dwelling density increases, but it will not be to an extent that is inconsistent with the surrounding area.
<b>13.</b>	<b>Objection</b>  IN19/72E3F373 I want to put forward my objections to the proposed changes to Lot 17 Sultana Road. I am a current homeowner and ratepayer who moved into a new home on Quince Way and this new proposal will directly affect my home as well as my current neighbours. I bought my property that resides in the Hales estate, as it was a quiet area that would have minimal traffic, which allows the area to be a perfect home to raise a family. The proposal to add so many new houses across the road from my home will reduce the beautiful openness of the area. It will greatly increase the amount of traffic coming and going in the area. With all the extra traffic that will lead to a need for extra parking. With the limited space for parking it will force so many extra cars to be parked on the street. Mangosteen Drive and Quince Way are inadequate to hold so many cars parked on the street and will cause congestion and hindrances to every resident in the area. The openness of this area is the main reason we bought this property and having a dense block of houses will undoubtedly drop the prices of my house and all the homeowners in the area. No one wants to live on top of each other with cars all the way down the street and this new proposal is what this would lead to. I beg all involved to reconsider this new development that will negatively impact all homeowners that do not want to see these changes happen.	Noted.  <b>Increased density being inconsistent with the surrounding area</b> The surrounding Residential development is predominately coded R20 with pockets of R12.5, R30 and R40. The proposed residential density of R20, R25 and R40 is considered in the similar band of low density. Officers acknowledge that there will be a different built form as dwelling density increases, but it will not be to an extent that is inconsistent with the surrounding area.  <b>The potential for increased crime</b> Residential developments will be assessed in accordance with the Crime Prevention through Environmental Design (CPTED) Principles laden in the Residential Design Codes such as passive surveillance, access, and landscaping. Officers are satisfied that the proposed development is unlikely to increase crime if dwellings and developments are designed in accordance with the Residential Design Codes.  <b>On Street Parking</b> Residential developments will be assessed in accordance with the requirements of the Residential Design Codes. Any dwellings with two or more bedrooms will be required to have a minimum of two on site car parking spaces.
<b>14.</b>	<b>Objection</b>  Good evening With reference to the above, I wish to advise I reject the proposal.	Noted.

**Response to Submissions Received  
Proposed Structure Plan Amendment – Lot 17 (228) Sultana Road East, Forrestfield**

<p><b>15.</b></p>	<p><b>Objection</b></p> <p>I wish to express my objection to the proposed amendment listed above, this area has not been designed to fit with this high density that is proposed. If council looks at the issues these are the impact to the residents and traffic. The previous roads built prior to the Hales development are not designed to deal with this amount of traffic and if you look at the proposal there is a lack of parking. The amount of cars that park on the road in the new development now and that also restrict the footpaths is an issue. Multiplied immensely when you look at the proposal. If you factor in the increase in traffic flow by having another exit from the houses that currently reside on Sultana Road. The council needs to understand that this area is a beautiful area and the residents just want to try and preserve the whole reason they decided to buy and build in the area. While not opposed to development of the area is in the fact that it is to be increased from 17 to 32 dwellings. This is a massive difference and WILL impact on the surrounding area.</p> <p>Thanks for your time,</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p><b>The potential for increased in traffic in the locality</b> The proposed rezoning has been amended to include an area of R25 as well as R20 and R40. This has reduced the possible increase in the number of dwellings from 15 to 10 dwellings per hectare. It is expected that the number of vehicle movements will be increased by a marginal number to what was originally considered in the Forrestfield U7 Structure Plan. In support of the amendment, a Traffic Engineering Report has been provided with the application. The report states the proposed changes to the Structure Plan will not have any negative impact to the surrounding network. The City's has reviewed the report and considers it is acceptable from a traffic engineering perspective. The existing and proposed future road network has capacity to accommodate the density increase.</p>
<p><b>16.</b></p>	<p><b>Objection</b></p> <p>I object to the proposed amendment for the reasons outlined below. Proposed Road Design and Impact I believe the will be an increase in noise and nuisance to residents on Gala Way, Blossom View, Quince way and Seville Rd, given that majority on the proposed lots will be more easily accessed via the southern end of the proposed road, off Quince Way. Due to the existing dwellings on the previously mentioned streets being located in a higher density area currently, resulting in the dwellings being in closer proximity to the road, these dwellings will be more highly impacted compared to the previous road design. This is due to a more direct route utilising Sultana Rd East, where majority of dwellings are set back at a much further distance from the road. By keeping a road connection to Sultana Rd East within the subdivision, traffic would be more likely to use this route, reducing the impact on existing residences. This include existing residences on Mangosteen</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p><b>The potential for increased in traffic in the locality</b> The proposed rezoning has been amended to include an area of R25 as well as R20 and R40. This has reduced the possible increase in the number of dwellings from 15 to 10 dwellings per hectare. It is expected that the number of vehicle movements will be increased by a marginal number to what was originally considered in the Forrestfield U7 Structure Plan. In support of the amendment, a Traffic Engineering Report has been provided with the application. The report states the proposed changes to the Structure Plan will not have any negative impact to the surrounding network. The City's has reviewed the report and considers it is acceptable from a traffic engineering perspective. The existing and proposed future road network has capacity to accommodate the density increase.</p> <p><b>Proposed Staggered distance</b> Noted. To avoid right turn overlapping, Liveable Neighbourhoods suggests a 20m staggered distance between intersections. As this is not</p>



**Response to Submissions Received  
Proposed Structure Plan Amendment – Lot 17 (228) Sultana Road East, Forrestfield**

<p>Drive and Cumquat Way, as the additional intersection will provide better dispersion of traffic throughout the area, rather than relying on the one entrance of Sultana Rd East and the one entrance off Quince Way. Particularly given the number of proposed strata lots, it is possible that this road will serve as a thoroughfare rather than simply servicing new residential lots. While the proposed road provides a suitable solution for the purpose of the subdivision, it does not integrate in a suitable way with the neighbouring area. The Traffic Engineering Report estimates only 23 vehicles trips in the peak hour via Mangosteen Drive or Quince Way. However, the likely impact of the creation of this proposed road is for Gala Way and Blossom View to become more of a thoroughfare for traffic to cut through to Sultana Rd East from Apricot St, or vice-versa. It will be highly detrimental to residents on both these relatively quiet streets, given the low volumes of traffic as current, with safety a potential issue given the current use of street parking on both streets. With further development of lots 12 and 13 Sultana Rd East possible in the future, the potential for this scenario will also increase. The misalignment of the proposed road and Blossom View to the south of the site is also of concern. As stated in the report: “The proposed road has a stagger of approximately 10m (centreline to centreline) to Blossom View. This does not comply with the Liveable Neighbourhoods requirement of 20m. However, Blossom View currently serves only 11 lots (9 vehicle trips in the peak hour).” This stagger would provide the only intersection of this type in the immediate area, which could potentially be confusing for motorists. It would also look out of place in regards to the aesthetics of the site, given the straight alignments utilised at nearby intersections. There is also no suggestion on how this would impact the drainage of water from the current intersection. I believe that there would also be an increased chance of vehicle impact on property if a motorist was to lose control at this intersection, especially if making a right-hand turn facing south towards Quince Way. The original ODP prior to amendment provides a more logical and beneficial solution, with access to the new lots provided from three entry points rather than two, dispersing traffic and reducing the impact on residents throughout the area as a whole. It is evident that the landowners of lots 16 and 17</p>	<p>being achieved, a subsequent traffic impact assessment needs to indicate an appropriate intersection treatment.</p> <p><b>Changes to Existing Built Form</b> No housing designs have been submitted at this stage for the proposed subdivision layout. It is recommended that a Local Development Plan is to be created in order to produce high quality housing stock with the amended subdivision layout and to supplement nearby housing designs.</p>
--	---

**Response to Submissions Received  
Proposed Structure Plan Amendment – Lot 17 (228) Sultana Road East, Forrestfield**

	<p>are not considering amalgamation of the two lots, which would provide a better base for the design on the subdivision. The current design is limited due to the current North/South boundary common to both lots 16 and 17, with this playing a key role in the stagger of the proposed road intersection. If the road alignment was to match that of Blossom View to remove the stagger, the lot sizes available to the east of the proposed road would be limited by the common boundary previously mentioned. This suggests that the design has been developed in a way to maximize monetary return for the owners, rather than to integrate efficiently with surrounding land uses. If the owners wished to try and integrate their subdivision into the area more effectively, amalgamation of lots 16 and 17 would enable a more flexible design to be created, with less negative impact on surrounding residences. Community and Aesthetics Section 2.1.1 of the Proposed Structure Plan Amendment document states: "Development of the surrounding area has occurred in a piecemeal fashion with mostly rural residential properties being subdivided on an individual basis according to the existing U7SP." I do not agree with this. Approximately one third of the Forrestfield U7 (Agreement Areas 2, 3 and 4) comprises of the Hales Estate, developed by Satterley. Dwellings in this development are influenced in design and condition to provide a sense of community and togetherness through visual similarities and design principles. Lot sizes in the immediate surrounding area are not as low as the proposed development, particularly the proposed strata lots. Lots in the adjoining Hales Estate are mostly 300sqm or more (I acknowledge the townhouse lots available with Stage 1B of the Hales Estate, however these dwellings have immediate access to POS, where new dwellings in the proposed subdivision do not). Also noting section 3.2.1 of the document: "Directions 2031 sets a target of 15 dwellings per gross urban zoned hectare of land in new development areas. The proposed amendment to the structure plan will permit a residential density of 33 dwellings per gross urban zoned hectare for the subject site." Whilst I acknowledge the aims and vision of Directions 2031 to target 15 dwellings per hectare in new developments, the outcome of 33 lots in the proposed development does not aim to blend with the surrounding neighbourhood, given that the</p>	
--	---	--

**Response to Submissions Received  
Proposed Structure Plan Amendment – Lot 17 (228) Sultana Road East, Forrestfield**

	<p>development is still within an area known for it's larger than cottage or unit size lots. Located in the Perth foothills, this area possesses a more natural feel, which would be ruined by over densifying the area with too many new dwellings. Rural land also exists in the immediate vicinity along with more realistic urban zoning of primarily R30, which also already covers the target of 15 dwellings per hectare. This was considered by Satterley with the Hales Estate development, as states on the Hales homepage: "The Hales is a leafy estate nestled in the heart of Forrestfield. This Forrestfield land is located 15km east of the Perth CBD within the Shire of Kalamunda, this development benefits from the proximity to nature and the existing community amenities, public transport and major road infrastructure. The exciting new Forrestfield-Airport link is due for completion in 2021. Designed with modern liveability in mind, The Hales will feature quality public open spaces, with all houses centred around a generous strip of parkland. The Hales is designed to retain the natural features of the site; built around existing native Marri and Jarrah trees and the trickling waters of Crumpet Creek." The proposed development provides no evidence of planning to match the aesthetics of the surrounding community, particularly the Hales Estate, which forms majority of the immediate surrounding area. Hales estate residents were required to meet design guidelines and criteria to have buildings plans accepted, with the aim to create a unified and visually appealing community through consistent design. As stated in the Hales Stage 1 Design Guidelines: "The Design Guidelines apply to residential lots within The Hales and will help you and your chosen builder to design a high-quality home that fits in with the aesthetic of the estate. The appearance of housing, front yards and verges contribute to community pride and property values. The Design Guidelines provide helpful information to assist the purchaser design their new home. The Design Guidelines are a framework for design decisions and provide for: A cohesive community; Attractive streetscapes; Quality housing design; Appropriate architectural styles; Individuality; Community safety and security; Climate responsive design; and Confidence in your investment." I believe that unless integrated design guidelines are applied to</p>	
--	--	--

**Response to Submissions Received  
Proposed Structure Plan Amendment – Lot 17 (228) Sultana Road East, Forrestfield**

	<p>the new subdivision, the aesthetics of the community and surrounding landscape will suffer as a result.</p> <p>Summary of Comments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• At the very least, the proposed road should match the alignment of Blossom View with no stagger. It would be preferable if there was an additional entry point to the subdivision from Sultana Rd East to provide a greater potential for dispersion of traffic.</li> <li>• Zoning at R20/R40 is of a more than necessary density for integration into the surrounding community. Strata lots especially do not fit in with the surrounding area.</li> <li>• Design guidelines to ensure that the new development can be integrated in way that is not detrimental to the surrounding neighbourhood should be implemented, with an aim to create harmony and desirable aesthetics with existing development.</li> </ul>	
<b>17.</b>	<p><b>Objection</b></p> <p>We object due to the obvious high increase in traffic directly near our property (on corner). We have previously expressed concerns about traffic behaviour etc and this development will increase this issue significantly! Obviously, this is suburbia however, we do not agree to the high density it will bring to the street &amp; area and have large concerns about the potential fall in property prices in our immediate area. We purchased us property in this area for more quieter living aspect in a suburb known to offer this. We do not deem this development at all necessary in our area and would be disappointed to learn if this is being done simply to generate more council rates for the Shire. There are more than enough new housing developments already in the suburb of Forrestfield ('The Hales') and do greatly hope this objection is respected by the Shire and the affect it will have on its residents. Thank you.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p><b>The potential for increased in traffic in the locality</b> The proposed rezoning has been amended to include an area of R25 as well as R20 and R40. This has reduced the possible increase in the number of dwellings from 15 to 10 dwellings per hectare. It is expected that the number of vehicle movements will be increased by a marginal number to what was originally considered in the Forrestfield U7 Structure Plan. In support of the amendment, a Traffic Engineering Report has been provided with the application. The report states the proposed changes to the Structure Plan will not have any negative impact to the surrounding network. The City's has reviewed the report and considers it is acceptable from a traffic engineering perspective. The existing and proposed future road network has capacity to accommodate the density increase.</p> <p><b>Increased density being inconsistent with the surrounding area</b> The surrounding Residential development is predominately coded R20 with pockets of R12.5, R30 and R40. The proposed residential density of R20, R25 and R40 is considered in the similar band of low density. Officers acknowledge that there will be a different built form as dwelling density increases, but it will not be to an extent that is inconsistent with the surrounding area.</p>
<b>18.</b>	<p><b>Objection</b></p>	<p>Noted.</p>

**Response to Submissions Received  
Proposed Structure Plan Amendment – Lot 17 (228) Sultana Road East, Forrestfield**

	<p>I am in opposition to the amendments of the above property for the following reasons: The density housing proposed to this area will impact the current residents in the surrounding areas in many ways. We have already experienced an increase in traffic and noise along Seville Road due to the subdivision which has been built between Quince Lane &amp; Gala Way. This is a family friendly street with many young children living along Seville Road and also Gala way, children are daily seen walking and riding to school along this street and also heading to the park on the corner of Seville and Gala Way, an increase in traffic caused by this high-density area will cause a hazard to the lifestyle that is enjoyed here. (Also, there are no footpaths for children to walk along!) The proposed size of the blocks will increase the amount of two story buildings in the area and existing housing will be overlooked by these which will create an invasion of the current resident's privacy of which we are all entitled to. High density living has an impact on people's health including mental health as residents are exposed to environmental stressors such as noise from neighbours, traffic and air pollution and also has the potential for an increase in crime. This area has been a semi-rural area and whilst I am not against new housing developments per se, I am against high density living which is what will happen if this proposed "MINOR" amendment is allowed. I do not see this as a "MINOR" amendment as I believe it will have a large impact on the current residents who live within close proximity to this structure plan.</p>	<p><b>The potential for increased in traffic in the locality</b> The proposed rezoning has been amended to include an area of R25 as well as R20 and R40. This has reduced the possible increase in the number of dwellings from 15 to 10 dwellings per hectare. It is expected that the number of vehicle movements will be increased by a marginal number to what was originally considered in the Forrestfield U7 Structure Plan. In support of the amendment, a Traffic Engineering Report has been provided with the application. The report states the proposed changes to the Structure Plan will not have any negative impact to the surrounding network. The City's has reviewed the report and considers it is acceptable from a traffic engineering perspective. The existing and proposed future road network has capacity to accommodate the density increase.</p> <p><b>The impact of an increased density on the amenity of the locality</b> The proposed Structure Plan Amendment is in accordance with the City's Local Planning Strategy and various State Government Strategic documents. Nonetheless, the City is committed to protecting surrounding residents from any potential impacts resulting from the proposed Structure Plan Amendment. Any issues relating to undue impacts upon surrounding landowners (i.e. privacy, overlooking, overshadowing, parking and traffic impacts) have been assessed or are more appropriately considered at subdivision and development stage.</p>
<p><b>19.</b></p>	<p><b>Objection</b></p> <p>I object to the proposed zoning change to 228 Sultana Rd East due the following: - The original density of R12.5 would have applied to the blocks along Sultana Rd East and this would be consistent with the other blocks and style of homes along Sultana Rd East that have recently developed. An ad-hoc approach to development can overall be unattractive - A density change to R40 for the remaining blocks would see a minimum block size of 180sqm. This density is better suited to inner urban areas. Again, this is not consistent with the rest of the suburb. - If this density change is allowed it would set a</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p><b>Increased density being inconsistent with the surrounding area</b> The surrounding Residential development is predominately coded R20 with pockets of R12.5, R30 and R40. The proposed residential density of R20, R25 and R40 is considered in the similar band of low density. Officers acknowledge that there will be a different built form as dwelling density increases, but it will not be to an extent that is inconsistent with the surrounding area.</p>

**Response to Submissions Received  
Proposed Structure Plan Amendment – Lot 17 (228) Sultana Road East, Forrestfield**

	<p>precedent for future developments not only along Sultana Rd East but other areas throughout the City. This level of density does not represent the lifestyle the City promotes. - Our current infrastructure and services do not support this density and its potential population. Historically the City has been slow to upgrade and provide infrastructure and services. Recent funding from the Federal Government has seen an improvement to the funds available for capital works. However, as we are no longer a marginal seat after the last election, it is unlikely that we will receive the same attention and election "sweeteners" in the near future. Although this increase density has the potential to increase overall revenue to the City this does not necessarily mean better services and infrastructure for rate payers. – The Planning Departments Directions 2031 document recommends a target of 15 dwelling per hectare. The original density meets this target. -A minimum density of R20 still provides a small enough land area for those looking for smaller and/or more affordable housing. It also maintains the suburban feel of the area. Any increase in density would lend itself to creating a more urban feel. Although this may seem appropriate to approve for one development, it sets a precedent that over the long term will completely change and potentially have a negative impact on the lifestyle and wellbeing of residents. - Urban infill is essential to the growth and function of not only our area but Perth as a whole. However, careful consideration and forward thinking must be given to the density permitted.</p>	
<p><b>20.</b></p>	<p><b>Objection</b></p> <p>I/We object to the density increase. This area of Forrestfield has a nice open semi-rural feel and look about it. Many people would have chosen this area because of this. The increase in density zoning has a negative effect as it will give rise to smaller blocks, higher buildings and increased population. The area is not suited to such changes and does not have or want the infrastructure necessary to support the increase in density. Already the smaller blocks that have been released and built on in the Hales is testament to this. Almost all of the houses in the Hales lacks sufficient land area to accommodate cars that</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p><b>The area should remain rural</b> The subject site is zoned 'Urban' under the MRS and 'Urban Development' under the City's LPS3. Development in the manner proposed is more consistent with the objectives of the current zoning than rural style development.</p> <p><b>Changes to Existing Built Form</b> No housing designs have been submitted at this stage for the proposed subdivision layout. It is recommended that a Local Development Plan is to</p>

**Response to Submissions Received  
Proposed Structure Plan Amendment – Lot 17 (228) Sultana Road East, Forrestfield**

	<p>belong to the residents. This increase in density zoning on smaller blocks will only worsen this situation. Higher buildings e.g. 2 storey and town houses will obstruct any views that people may have. The reduction in block sizes also means that houses are being built closer together. This has the potential to cause disharmony among the general population of an area as privacy is lost. Most people value their personal space and privacy, another reason that people were attracted to the semi-rural open spaces of this area. Therefore, future zoning and planning to increase the density and population is not welcomed in this area. Most of the blocks in the well-established area are approx. 3 times the land area of the proposed development and some of those will now have up to 4 additional properties neighbouring on to their properties. Whilst most of us accept that we have neighbours behind us and to the sides of us if we wanted to be surrounded by that many houses/people we would have chosen to live in units. However, we have chosen this area of Forrestfield as it had a lower density rating and still maintained a semi-rural open living feel, this is about to be lost. A sad predicament.</p>	<p>be created in order to produce high quality housing stock with the amended subdivision layout and to supplement nearby housing designs.</p> <p><b>The impact of an increased density on the amenity of the locality</b> The proposed Structure Plan Amendment is in accordance with the City's Local Planning Strategy and various State Government Strategic documents. Nonetheless, the City is committed to protecting surrounding residents from any potential impacts resulting from the proposed Structure Plan Amendment. Any issues relating to undue impacts upon surrounding landowners (i.e. privacy, overlooking, overshadowing, parking and traffic impacts) have been assessed or are more appropriately considered at subdivision and development stage.</p>
<p><b>21.</b></p>	<p><b>Objection</b>  Verbatim to Submission 19.</p>	<p>Refer to response for submission 19.</p>
<p><b>22.</b></p>	<p><b>Objection</b> I would like to express my objection to the proposed changes to Lot 17 Sultana Road. As an owner/occupier and ratepayer who purchased our property on Seville Road, I believe that these changes will negatively affect not only my home but all the others in the vicinity, both for the dwellings that have been in existence on and around Seville Road and Gala Way since before the development of The Hales and also the dwellings within The Hales estate. We purchased our property because we liked the area, the size of the blocks, the fact it was not hugely busy and a good area to settle down and raise a family. We were happy when we heard about the rail line going in as well. However, the proposed development is simply too dense. With so many extra dwellings in such a limited space, this is going to cause a large increase in traffic to us once-quiet and safe streets in this neighbourhood and I believe that such small</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p><b>Increased density being inconsistent with the surrounding area</b> The surrounding Residential development is predominately coded R20 with pockets of R12.5, R30 and R40. The proposed residential density of R20, R25 and R40 is considered in the similar band of low density. Officers acknowledge that there will be a different built form as dwelling density increases, but it will not be to an extent that is inconsistent with the surrounding area.</p> <p><b>The potential for increased in traffic in the locality</b> The proposed rezoning has been amended to include an area of R25 as well as R20 and R40. This has reduced the possible increase in the number of dwellings from 15 to 10 dwellings per hectare. It is expected that the number of vehicle movements will be increased by a marginal number to what was originally considered in the Forrestfield U7 Structure</p>

**Response to Submissions Received  
Proposed Structure Plan Amendment – Lot 17 (228) Sultana Road East, Forrestfield**

	<p>dwelling will have very limited space for car parking. We are not an inner-city suburb where street parking is considered the norm and if the area was like that when we were looking to buy our house we never would have bought here. That being said if I was looking to purchase a home I would not want to purchase a house like mine with so much dense housing and crowded streets around it. As such this reflects my belief that it would also result in a decrease in the value of my property. We paid good money for our property and I vehemently object to the density and traffic that I believe this development will cause and do not believe it is fair on all the property owners in this area to have to face a decrease in the value of their properties in these already difficult times. Not only that, but I do not believe the area in question is suited to a development of such density. Simple changes to Quince Lane and Mangosteen Drive will not be sufficient to sustain the large increase in population of the proposed area and the neighbourhood is meant to be one of relaxed family homes not tightly, packed units with people crammed everywhere. I urge all involved to see reason regarding this development and not subject the homeowners in the area to the heartache associated with these unnecessary and unsuitable changes to our beloved neighbourhood.</p>	<p>Plan. In support of the amendment, a Traffic Engineering Report has been provided with the application. The report states the proposed changes to the Structure Plan will not have any negative impact to the surrounding network. The City's has reviewed the report and considers it is acceptable from a traffic engineering perspective. The existing and proposed future road network has capacity to accommodate the density increase.</p>
<p><b>23.</b></p>	<p><b>Objection</b>  Verbatim to Submission 22.</p>	<p>Refer to response for submission 22.</p>
<p><b>24.</b></p>	<p><b>Objection</b>  Verbatim to Submission 22.</p>	<p>Refer to response for submission 22.</p>
<p><b>25.</b></p>	<p><b>Objection</b> Too dense for the suburbia of Seville Rd and surrounding streets. Loss of huge trees that house nesting birds of prey. Two story house towering over bungalows, loss of privacy.</p>	<p>Noted.  <b>Environmental Impact</b> Efforts to retain any remnant vegetation on site can be dealt with at the subdivision phase through the submission of a Local Development Plan.  <b>The impact of an increased density on the amenity of the locality</b></p>



**Response to Submissions Received  
Proposed Structure Plan Amendment – Lot 17 (228) Sultana Road East, Forrestfield**

		<p>The proposed Structure Plan Amendment is in accordance with the City's Local Planning Strategy and various State Government Strategic documents.</p> <p>Nonetheless, the City is committed to protecting surrounding residents from any potential impacts resulting from the proposed Structure Plan Amendment.</p> <p>Any issues relating to undue impacts upon surrounding landowners (i.e. privacy, overlooking, overshadowing, parking and traffic impacts) have been assessed or are more appropriately considered at subdivision and development stage.</p>
<b>26.</b>	<p><b>Objection</b></p> <p>Verbatim to Submission 22.</p>	Refer to response for submission 22.
<b>27.</b>	<p><b>Objection</b></p> <p>Verbatim to Submission 12.</p>	Refer to response for Submission 12.
<b>28.</b>	<p><b>Non-Objection (DFES)</b></p> <p>RE: PROPOSED MINOR AMENDMENT TO STRUCTURE PLAN – LOT 17 (228) SULTANA ROAD EAST, FORRESTFIELD WA 6058</p> <p>I refer to your letter dated 18 June 2019 regarding the submission of a Bushfire Management Plan (BMP) (Revision 1), prepared by WABAL and dated 27 March 2019, as part of the above Structure Plan.</p> <p>It should be noted that this advice relates only to State Planning Policy 3.7 Planning in Bushfire Prone Areas (SPP 3.7) and the Guidelines for Planning in Bushfire Prone Areas (Guidelines). It is the responsibility of the proponent to ensure that the proposal complies with all other relevant planning policies and building regulations where necessary. This advice does not exempt the applicant/proponent from obtaining necessary approvals that may apply to the proposal including planning, building, health or any other approvals required by a relevant authority under other written laws.</p> <p><b><i>Recommendation – supported compliant application</i></b></p>	Noted.

**Response to Submissions Received  
Proposed Structure Plan Amendment – Lot 17 (228) Sultana Road East, Forrestfield**

	<p>DFES advises that the BMP has adequately identified issues arising from the bushfire risk assessment and considered how compliance with the bushfire protection criteria can be achieved.</p>	
<p><b>29.</b></p>	<p><b>Objection</b></p> <p>The subdivision behind me having small blocks means two or more storey buildings will be on my fence line looking into my property. These blocks are way too small for this area. I find this appalling and unfair to those of us who own parallel properties</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p><b>The impact of an increased density on the amenity of the locality</b> The proposed Structure Plan Amendment is in accordance with the City's Local Planning Strategy and various State Government Strategic documents. Nonetheless, the City is committed to protecting surrounding residents from any potential impacts resulting from the proposed Structure Plan Amendment. Any issues relating to undue impacts upon surrounding landowners (i.e. privacy, overlooking, overshadowing, parking and traffic impacts) have been assessed or are more appropriately considered at subdivision and development stage.</p>