



t: (08) 9226 4276  
 e: admin@tbbplanning.com.au  
[taylorburrellbarnett.com.au](http://taylorburrellbarnett.com.au)

## MEMORANDUM

**Subject** Structure Plan Amendment for Lot 12 (No.256) Sultana Road East – Public Submission & Referral Responses  
**Date** 29 August 2024  
**Reference** 23/070  
**To** City of Kalamunda  
**From** Taylor Burrell Barnett

Table 1 Submission and Referral Responses

No.	Nature of Submission	Submission	Applicant Response
1	<b>Do Not Support</b>	We believe that the proposed row of 4 blocks located on Sultana Road East (facing) should be larger in size (locating 2 blocks of land of larger size: 600-800sqm). In this proposal, there are too many blocks facing Sultana Road East which will impact parking, traffic and the lovely nature that this area offers. We have always been a "home in the Forrest".	We acknowledge your concern regarding the size of the blocks facing Sultana Road East. The proposed layout was designed to balance the need for additional housing with maintaining the character of the neighbourhood. The proposal has been informed by the role and hierarchy of Sultana Road East, the existing surrounding development fronting the road and the desire for a transition of development intensity abutting Sultana Road East. Consequently, the design outcome proposes a lower density (R25) interface along Sultana Road East allowing for a more

Toddtville Prospecting Pty Ltd (ACN 008 735 153)  
 ATF The Taylor & Burrell Unit Trust trading as Taylor Burrell Barnett  
 (ABN 74 831 437 925)

**Office address:**  
 Level 7  
 160 St Georges Terrace  
 Perth WA 6000

**Postal address:**  
 PO Box 7130  
 Cloisters Square  
 Perth WA 6850



No.	Nature of Submission	Submission	Applicant Response
			<p>consistent streetscape design whilst balancing a more contemporary residential density for the site and more efficient subdivision layout.</p> <p>It should also be noted that the identification of four lots along the frontage to Sultana Road east is consistent with the R12.5, R20 or R25 subdivision requirements, with only the proposed depth of the lots differing to accommodate the differing lot size requirements, as the frontage widths of the lots would be compliant under any of these density coding scenarios.</p>
2	Do Not Support	N/A	Noted.
3	Do Not Support	<p>It was not clear how large the trees on Lot 12 are. There are a lot of very large trees that are home/used by native birds. Can you please advise how large the trees on Lot12 are, whether native wildlife has been taken into account and whether the plan submitted includes retention of all large trees on the lot. If all the large trees are retained across the area with 0 removed I would be happy to change my support. Birds of prey no longer visit/ live in the area because another area of the estate removed the three large nesting trees that the breeding pair returned to each year. Please confirm this is not the case for this subdivision.</p>	<p>The proposed amendment has considered environmental values present on the subject site, identifying that the site does not contain any significant vegetation or environmental features on site.</p> <p>The existing large trees that interface with the site on the western and eastern boundaries are located on the neighbouring lots (Lots 11 &amp; 13) and are not located within Lot 12. Mature trees also sit adjacent to the front boundary within the Sultana Road East road verge, and are not located within Lot 12.</p>
4	Comment Only	<p>I purchased my vacant block at Bardook Gardens when it was developed due to its size which is small in comparison to some lots available however in our area here in Forrestfield it was among the largest newly developed lots available and my and my family's thoughts were that we'd likely not find another lot close to home that is the size of these. Both my brother and sister have also bought and built</p>	<p>Respondents feedback is noted and appreciated.</p>



No.	Nature of Submission	Submission	Applicant Response
		<p>in the vicinity of the Tyler Springs and Sultana Rd developments in recent years and I am yet to begin building. We all jumped at the chance to buy a block each and build a home close to our family home we grew up in. Our parents were drawn to the area to build their home here in Forrestfield before us kids were born due to the large open areas and abundance of greenery with semi rural feel of the hills/foothills. Although myself and my siblings have each bought vacant land as part of the subdivision and development of larger pockets of land in the area, my comments regarding the proposed development in question is that I feel it is a shame that these original larger rural sized blocks in the suburb which was one of the drawcards of the area are now being cut up and subdivided into such small lots, eg: 180m2. I understand the owners of these types of blocks get to a point in their lives where they'd like to make some money back from the land they own by subdividing, however it is disappointing that the resulting lots are so small and compact and they're not in keeping with the surroundings. I'm not against development at all but I think the shire should just be a little conscious of how many of these original large established blocks are subdivided and also the small size of the resulting lots developed in order to maintain what makes the area attractive to live amongst. Thanks.</p>	
5	Comment Only	<p>I am concerned with the increased traffic on Mangosteen drive. Better road signs will be needed for cars turning from Mangosteen drive to cumquat way and vice versa, with clear access priority. Road lines to divide the road for the traffic.</p>	<p>A Transport Impact Statement has been prepared in support of the Amendment, demonstrating that the increase in traffic volume is minimal and will have no significant impact on the surrounding road network.</p>



No.	Nature of Submission	Submission	Applicant Response
			<p>The proposed access arrangements seek to improve the local road network and connectivity by allowing access from the adjacent subdivision east, west and south of the site to Sultana Road East.</p> <p>All roads will be designed in accordance with the City of Kalamunda's required design and safety standards.</p>
<p><b>6</b></p>	<p><b>Supported</b></p>	<p>Supported, but would like it noted that the proposed closest/best public transport option is likely not actually the 270 on Hawtin Road, but the 271 and 280 on Berkshire Road for the proposed development.</p> <p>271 and 280 share a route until the stops on Berkshire Rd near Bardook Gdns toward High Wycombe Station (Berkshire Before Illex), and near Karlak Cct away from HW (Berkshire Before Mandevillea). Together they run at one or two buses for every train arrival and departure for most of the day and is a significant increase on the frequency of the 270 (which is approx every two trains).</p> <p>Further, for these two stops, it is likely that the walk via the Crumpet Creek Reserve footpaths and Bardook Gardens to Berkshire Road is a much shorter walk (650-700 metres by my rough estimation) than going down Sultana Road E to Hawtin Road (1.2-1.3km). The resulting bus journey is also significantly shorter at approx 3km vs approx 5.5kms (the 271/280 run straight down Berkshire &gt; Dundas and straight into the station instead of going all the way around Hawtin Road and then back up Maida Vale Road).</p>	<p>Noted and appreciated.</p>



No.	Nature of Submission	Submission	Applicant Response
		<p>Personally I would advertise the 271/280 as the primary mode of public transport to the new development and any in adjacent lots. I think the improvement to service levels for the 271/280 option is material and represents a substantial increase in the feasibility of taking Public Transport from the proposed development.</p> <p>I would want to know also that the best option can typically take you to the station and straight onto a train with a 5-7 minute wait time every 12-15 minutes for most of the day (and the same for the way back home), as this makes PT a viable option.</p> <p>I'm obviously not sure what happens with this feedback or whether it matters, but I just wanted it on record that the public transport option is actually a LOT better than identified in the Transport Impact Statement. Using the 270 as the best option sells the connectivity of the area incredibly short in my view.</p>	
7	<b>Do not support.</b>	Design of land not sustainable with the area	The proposed development has been carefully designed to facilitate a range of dwelling types including but not limited to single detached dwellings, grouped dwellings and terrace home style development, responding to changing market conditions that seeks to deliver an optimal outcome for existing and future residents.
8	<b>Do not support</b>	Will be adding extra danger to an already dangerous corner Children play area affected adversely and making an already busy and dangerous road worse	A Transport Impact Statement (TIS) has been prepared in support of the Amendment, demonstrating that the increase in traffic volume is minimal and will have no significant impact on the surrounding road network.
9	<b>Do not support</b>	I have small children who frequently cross canopy circuit to play at the playground & ride their bikes. Frequently crossing	



No.	Nature of Submission	Submission	Applicant Response
		Canopy circuit to ride on the path around the park, along with many other children that live in the area. By opening up Canopy circuit to traffic will inevitably put these children at risk of being hit by a car so I am strongly against This proposal going forward.	Additionally, the TIS did not identify any safety issues generated from amendment.  The proposed vehicle arrangements have been informed as a design response to connect new roads to the surrounding existing and proposed roads, improving legibility and permeability locally.
10	Do not support	The increase in vehicle traffic will be invasive and dangerous adding more danger to pedestrians and homeowners. Lots of children run down to and around the park regularly crossing Canopy Circuit. We chose our plot because it was in a quiet location. Traffic should go out onto Sultana Road East only not on to a high density residential area such as Canopy Circuit.	In conjunction, the design has identified opportunities to integrate the proposed footpath / shared path network with the existing network and the areas abutting public open space.
11	Support	N/A	Noted.
12	Do not support	The proposed development aims to modify the density coding from R12.5 and R20 to a range of R25-R40. This increase in density might not align with the current character and housing needs of the area as identified in the Local Housing Strategy, which aims to promote a diverse housing mix that might not be achieved with higher densities. The development proposes removing a small portion of public open space, with a cash-in-lieu contribution instead. This could lead to a reduction in green spaces, which are vital for community well-being and environmental sustainability.	The proposed amendment has been considered the City's Local Housing Strategy which identifies a need to support dwelling targets by promoting increased residential densities. The proposal addresses this strategic direction, and is otherwise consistent with the identification of the area as suitable for residential growth both in the strategic planning framework and the longstanding Outline Development Plan approved for the broader precinct.  The shifting of a small portion of public open space to cash-in-lieu will not lead to a reduction in green spaces below the 10% policy guidance, but rather a greater quality of open spaces provided as the cash-in-lieu will be used for upgrades to existing open space areas.
13	Do not support	Too many dwellings.	
14	Do not support	As a neighbour I do not support the proposed development or amendment to development next-door being Lot 12 256 Sultana Road East.	We appreciate your desire to maintain the peaceful rural atmosphere.



No.	Nature of Submission	Submission	Applicant Response
		<p>We bought our property to enjoy the peaceful lifestyle as we were told the council would never develop or rezone our rural property to urban zoning. We have Crumpet Creek entering our back property in a loop and public open space adjoining the back fence. Nearby residents and children especially often look over our open fence to admire our sheep and play in the creek. My husband and I don't support building townhouses R40 zoning next door. We don't want neighbours looking through windows viewing our backyard and takeaway our privacy.</p>	<p>It is important to note that the subject sites, inclusive of Lots 11, 12 and 13 Sultana Road East, have been identified as residential development sites under the City's Outline Development Plan for many years.</p> <p>The subject site is, under the current planning framework, available for residential development at an R12.5 and R20 density coding, and applications for this density development could proceed immediately.</p> <p>The request in this application is to consider a density coding which is more reflective of the surrounding density of residential development and provides a greater diversity of housing supply for the broader community.</p> <p>We recognise that there are impacts of residential development on adjacent neighbours. The Residential Design Codes provides for these impacts to be mitigated, particularly with respect to visual privacy and amenity of abutting land parcels and existing land uses. At the subdivision and development stage this will be further considered, irrespective of the outcome of the current ODP Amendment stage.</p> <p>The City will be responsible for assessment of future applications against the Residential Design Codes and the broader planning framework, and assessment and determination of the impact on adjacent neighbouring properties.</p> <p>This application, however, creates no additional impact on privacy or amenity of neighbouring properties.</p>



No.	Nature of Submission	Submission	Applicant Response
<b>Agency Submissions</b>			
1	<b>Agency Submission</b>	<p><b>Water Corporation</b> The proposals appear to be minor in nature and the Water Corporation has no immediate concerns with the amendments.</p> <p>The Water Corporation's concept planning for water and sewer extensions through this land will need to be modified to reflect the amendments the contours in this area. The proponent's consulting engineer should be advised to submit plans showing the proposed extensions to the sewer and water networks prior to submitting subdivision applications over this land.</p> <p>Water Corporation's declared drainage area. A local water management strategy/UWMP should be required prior to the subdivision stage to demonstrate that runoff from the subject land will be retained on site to predevelopment levels and to make adequate provision for 1% ARI storm events within the subject land.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Civil engineering plans will reflect the proposed extensions to the sewer and water networks, and will demonstrate the adequate provision of 1% can be achieved, at the subdivision stage.</p>