Urbanize Pty Ltd

Date: 21st July 2026

City of South Perth
Planning Services
Civic Centre
South Perth, WA 6151

Re: Planning Justification for Proposed addition
Property: 21 Collins Street, Kensington, 6151
Applicant: Simon Maxwell, Director of Urbanize (on behalf of Sam & Adrianne Hughes)

Dear Sir/Madam,
We submit this formal planning justification in support of the proposed development at the above property. (Proposed additions to 21 Collins Street, Kensington, 6151.)
The proposal consists of a double-brick extension incorporating both single-storey and two-storey elements, located at the rear of the existing dwelling.
The original residence will remain unchanged, aside from the removal of small a single-brick addition at the rear and the existing rear shed at the rear of the property.
We confirm that the proposed development has been designed to comply with the applicable provisions of the Residential Design Codes (R-Codes) and the Local Planning Policy 1.1 Residential Development
as outlined below:

Deemed to comply		
3.3 – Street setbacks	Clause 3.3 C3.3.4 and C3.3.5 of the R-Codes are replaced with the following deemed-to-comply requirements: **Table 3.3a** Minimum setback of buildings from the street **C3.3.6** Garages and carports are set back from a secondary street, right-of way and communal street in accordance with Table 3.3a.	**Complies**
3.4 Lot boundary setbacks	**C3.4.1** Buildings are set back from lot boundaries in accordance with Table 3.4a.	**Complies**
3.6 – Streetscape	**Addressing the street** **C3.6.1** Single houses and grouped dwellings are designed to address the primary street in accordance with the following:	**Complies**
3.6 – Streetscape	**Street walls and fences** Clause 3.6 C3.6.1 and C3.6.7 – C3.6.9 of the R-Codes are replaced with the following deemed-to-comply requirements: **C3.6.7** Front fences, including gates, within the primary street setback	**Complies**

13 Central Avenue Beaconsfield 6162. P.O. Box 1940 Subiaco. Tele: 0438420344
Email: simon@urbanize.com.au

	area: i. are visually permeable above 1.2m from the verge level to a maximum height of 1.8m, measured from the street side of the fence ii. C3.6.8 Fences within a secondary street setback area are restricted to a maximum height of 1.8m above natural ground	
3.7 – Access Sightlines C3.7.7	**Clause 3.7 C3.7.7** (Sightlines) of the R-Codes is modified to include the following additional deemed-to-comply requirement: C3.7.14 Within the 1.5m truncation area stipulated under C3.7.7, the following structures are permissible: i. A single pier with a maximum height of 2.1m as measured from natural ground level on the street side of the fence and a maximum dimension of 0.3m; and ii. 80% visually permeable fencing above 0.75m to a maximum height of 1.8m, as measured from natural ground level on the street side of the fence.	**Complies**
3.9 Solar access for adjoining sites	**C3.9.1** In climate zones 4, 5, and 6, development is designed that its shadow cast at midday, 21 June (refer Figure 3.9a) onto any other adjoining property and/or diagonally adjacent lot (refer Figure 3.9b) does not exceed the limits set out in Table 3.9a.	**Complies**
3.10 Visual privacy	**For development adjoining an existing dwelling** **C3.10.1** All sources of overlooking are oriented, offset or setback in accordance with Table 3.10a so that the cone of vision (refer Figure 3.10a) does not capture major openings and/or active habitable spaces on an adjoining property Note Cone of vision shown after additional screening has been added to the balcony	**Complies**

LPP 3.2 local-planning-policy-tree-retention
As per our consultant Arborist 'Arborite 30-03-26' it is our consultants opinion that the tree can successfully be retained.

It should be noted that he has contacted the City for contact details of the City's Arborist in order to discuss their differences. As yet there has been no response.

Regarding the excavation of the trenches I can confirm the base of the trenches correspond to the underside of the proposed footings indicating there will be no root damage from the works.

We have faith in our consultant and believe we can complete the works while successfully retaining the trees.

Should the City still be of the opinion that the trees will not survive. We will be happy to remove the trees and replace them as per the mitigation measures identified within LPP 3.2

This could either on site or on the Vista Street crossover where large areas of cross-over and parking are to be removed and re landscaped.

ROOF FORM (FLAT ROOF) – SECONDARY STREET JUSTIFICATION – LPP P351.5

The property lies within Precinct 5/6 under LPP P351.5. While flat roofs are generally non-preferred, the proposed variation is justified as the roof is located along a secondary street with low visual impact, reduces overall building bulk, minimizes overshadowing, supports better amenity outcomes, and aligns with broader planning framework discretion. Given the greater exposure and design constraints applicable to corner lots, a prescriptive preference for pitched roofs can result in an inequitable outcome.

The original dwelling, existing garden landscaping, and front boundary fencing are all being retained in full along the primary street frontage, ensuring that the established character and presentation of the site remain unchanged. These retained elements maintain the visual continuity and desired streetscape qualities.

The design fully conforms to the requirements of the policy when viewed from the primary street (Collins)
The fabric of the original cottage is retained.
To apply the policy to secondary streets adds significantly more lot area to be considered than normally would. This a far greater impost on all the corner lots in the policy precinct and could be considered to discriminate against those lots.

The Design references art deco elements which are a notable feature of many residences throughout the suburb.
These elements are also reflected by the existing concrete porch roof.

The skillion roof separates the two massing areas of the dwelling. The flat roof of the Western section lowers the profile of that portion, helping to balance scale of the western section with the existing dwelling to the East.

When introducing additions to heritage or period buildings it is architectural best practice to not copy the original building but provide differing elements and materials that complement and reference the existing building. The extension has been designed with a modern aesthetic, creating a clear distinction from the existing building rather than serving as a direct imitation. This is a well-established architectural design approach that creates a deliberate contrast between the new addition and the existing building.

It is our observation that this design approach is already evident in the immediate locality to our proposed design.
Examples of existing flat roofs which incorporate this design in the immediate area include 74 Collins Street, 56 Collins Street, 47 Dyson street and 16 Broad Street



16 Broad Street



74 Collins Street

13 Central Avenue Beaconsfield 6162. P.O. Box 1940 Subiaco. Tele: 0438420344
Email: simon@urbanize.com.au

Urbanize Pty Ltd



47 Dyson Street



56 Collins Street

Crossover location / Verge landscaping

The proposed crossover location is a widening of the existing crossover on Vista Street. The proximity of the corner and the location of the significant verge tree on Collins Street means this is the only viable location for the crossover to be located. This will mean the removal of one of the small trees within the landscaped verge to Vista Street. It is my understanding that this landscaped area was provided by the residents of 21 Collins. The area contains 4 trees of which the one to be removed is the least significant.

As per your most recent advice, the existing limestone parking will be removed and replaced with complementary landscaping. In addition, the southern portion of the existing crossover will be removed and the verge restored, maintaining a separation of no less than 0.5 metres from the right-of-way (ROW) and the south-western lot boundary. As previously mentioned, the creation of these two landscape areas provide a great opportunity for the additional planting of significant trees.

Conclusion

The proposed development upholds the policy intent by maintaining primary streetscape character, improving amenity, and ensuring practical development function. We respectfully request the City's support and approval.

Yours sincerely

Simon Maxwell| Director

URBANIZE

Urbanize has a new look! Click here to visit our new website
(08) 6243 6405
0438420344
simon@urbanize.com.au 13 Central Avenue,
Beaconsfield, 6162 www.urbanize.com.au