

**PROPOSED AMENDMENTS / RESOLUTIONS AT
COMMITTEE OR COUNCIL MEETINGS
(Elected Members)**

Name:	Cr Katy Mair
Date of Meeting:	17 March 2020
Meeting of the:	Ordinary Council Meeting
Item No.	P20/3841
Title of Item	Six Multiple Dwellings at Lot 235 (5) Grimsay Road, Ardress WA 6153

Disclaimer: Where administration has provided any assistance with the framing and/or wording of any motion/amendment to the Elected Member who has advised their intention to move it, the assistance has been provided on an impartial basis. The principle and intention expressed in any motion/amendment is solely that of the intended mover and not that of the officer/officers providing the assistance. Under no circumstance is it to be expressed to any party that administration or any officer holds a view on this motion other than that expressed in an official written or verbal report by administration to the Committee or Council meeting considering the motion.

REJECT AND REPLACE MOTION:

(If an amendment is proposed, please identify the words being amended and reasons for the amendment)

That the development be rejected for the following reasons:

- 1. Plot ratio of 0.69 is too high for R40 development area when it should be 0.6.**
- 2. The building envelope is being pushed out too much by an additional 11.5%**
- 3. The plot ratio of 0.69 results in an additional 65.52 square metres of floor area which is a 15% increase over the allowable 436.8 square metres.**
- 4. The 65.52 square metres represents almost the same size of one of the smaller units which is 79 square metres.**
- 5. That Side and Rear Setbacks are non compliant.**
- 6. That the six multiple dwellings proposed for the site will potentially go to SAT since it requests a greater than allowable building bulk.**

REASONS:

Six objections were received and a petition with 100 signatures was received by Council against this development. The issues of concern were loss of privacy, overshadowing impacts, removal of existing trees, the scale of development is inappropriate for the site, there is insufficient car parking and vehicle access is not satisfactory, traffic impact on immediate and surrounding streets, noise impacts, poor transition between sites, excessive screening on balconies, loss of views, adverse impacts from external fixtures. All of these were not upheld by officers who have applied discretion and comments which reflect their views which are not consistent with residents' views.

SIGNATURE: _____