No	Submitter Comments	Applicant Response	Officer Comment
	I wish to object the development application for the proposed dwelling on 14 Kellet Drive. Due to the time constraints for the deadline to place my objection over the Christmas and New Year period, I have been unable to seek professional advice on this matter. I object for the following reasons:		
	 (1) Owners recently purchased the property under the existing zoning with building envelope requirements in place and knowledge of existing sheds placement within the existing building envelope. 	No comments from the applicant.	Noted.
	(2) Size of the shed already exceeds current dimensions allowed under the Serpentine Jarrahdale (SJ) building guidelines, however it's size and placement within the existing building envelope was approved by the shire of SJ.	No comments from the applicant.	Noted - the shed was approved by Council at its Ordinary Council Meeting of 21 December 1998 and therefore not subject to reconsideration.
	(3) Topography and vegetation of the block has not altered since the subdivision was established in 1998 with reasons for the building envelopes placement still relevant. All other properties within Kellet Drive complying with these requirements under the current zoning regulations. There is a precedence of compliance with building envelopes in Kellet Drive.	The dwelling will provide a setback of over 75m and 28m – 30m to the adjoining side boundaries. As a result, any associated built form as viewed from Kellet Drive streetscape and the adjoining properties will be minimal.	Whilst existing development is generally located within the building envelope on Kellet Drive, given the proposed set back would be 75m, it is considered that this is consistent with the overall streetscape given the adhoc setbacks of building envelopes and development along the street.
	(4) The dimensions and size of the existing building envelope is extremely generous. The proposal increases Shire of Serpentine Jarrahdale Town Planning Scheme 2 section 5.12.9 c notes that a building envelope shall not exceed 1,000sqm.	No comments from the applicant.	Noted – the application does not propose to increase the size of the building envelope.

No	Submitter Comments	Applicant Response	Officer Comment
	(5) The proposal is not just relocating the existing size and dimensions of the building envelope but extending the building envelope significantly which will cover a higher percentage of the land. It doesn't allow for the clustering buildings within the building envelope on the block to give the intent of rural aesthetics, allowing for larger areas of land around the buildings, therefore contributing to a "rural setting". This proposed building envelope sprawls structures across the block greatly impacting the rural aspect.	It is considered the proposal will be in- keeping with the objectives of the zoning of the Rural Residential. The proposal will maintain the rural amenity of the locality. It is considered the proposal will have no adverse impact on the streetscape and the neighbouring properties, whilst maintaining the intent of the rural residential lifestyle.	Despite the 'Single House' being proposed outside the building envelope, it maintains a clustered form of development. The location of the house would be in close proximity to the existing shed and water tank, maintaining the rural residential character by way of clustered development.
	(6) Sheds are a structure which can be dismantled. The existing shed can be removed for the provision of building the residence within the building envelope and a more suitably sized shed for special rural zoning be built.	We have also installed a large number of solar panels on the existing shed and an oversized invertor to reduce our carbon footprint.	Noted – The shed was approved by Council at its Ordinary Council Meeting of 21 December 1998. The proposal does not seek to alter its location, therefore not subject to reconsideration.
	(7) Location of all structures within the proposed extended building envelope is not specified or reflected in plans provided. E.g., water tank.	No comments from the applicant. Amended Plans submitted with location of existing water tank.	The subject site is currently developed with a shed and a water tank approved by Council on 21 December 1998.
	(8) Privacy concerns. There are no mature trees or shrubs along the boundary fence inline/adjacent to the proposed extended building envelope on 14 Kellet Drive. No shelter belts or trees have been	Since purchasing the block, we have been proactive in planting new	Please see point 9 below regarding the tree planting concerns.

No	Submitter Comments	Applicant Response	Officer Comment
	planted in this location since the property was purchased. There is no shelter belt or screening along the boundary in the same area on 19 Kellet Drive. I have no reticulation or ability to establish water trees and shrubs in this location or the means to fence livestock off. An existing rural post and wire fence along with no screening, leaves this location completely exposed.	native vegetation on the block to encourage native flora and fauna back to the area and have a long- term vision of creating a home that has minimal environmental impact. Once the site location has been approved by local council, we will be continuing planting large established native flora on our block.	With the visual privacy concern, there is a significant distance maintained between the proposed dwelling and the adjoining neighbours dwelling (60m), as well as the equestrian activities (62m). Officers therefore consider that the visibility from the windows and outdoor living area would not adversely impact on visual privacy of the neighbouring property.
	(9) The existing building envelopes placement has a shelter belt of mature trees located both sides of the boundary fence. An addition 15m of fencing can additionally be erected allowing for complete privacy for both residences and also assisting in noise and dust control.	It is important to us that our proposed building has minimal impact on existing flora and fauna to the area.	There is an existing mature tree line that extends along the entire western lot boundary. This vegetation assists in maintaining the rural character and the natural landscape characteristics, consistent with TPS2 and draft LPS3. However, given the increased lot boundary setback, as required by the R- Codes, and the extent of existing vegetation contributing towards the rural character of the locality, it is considered that there should be no further requirement for the applicant to provide additional screening.

No	Submitter Comments	Applicant Response	Officer Comment
	Additionally, I am a para equestrian rider and bought my property back in 1998 to enjoy my horses and semi-rural lifestyle. My riding arena was purposely constructed at the very back of my property towards the centre property for many reasons. Horses are a flight animal and this assists in mitigating safety issues with horses been spooked. This is a particular concern during construction of structures and with my disability a major safety issue. The arenas location also is for the consideration of the neighbours as I ride my horses every day, in all conditions and at various times of day and night. Its placement assists in dust control and any other impacts that may affect my neighbours as a courtesy. The bottom 3rd of 14 Kellet Drive is identified as a floodplain incompatible with development and I thought this would ensure the safe placement of the arena. I spend the majority of my time on my property schooling my horses in this area. My view will be an unobscured one of their houses rather than rural paddocks. The proposed position of this residence will affect having quiet enjoyment of my property, will affect rural residential amenity and my quality of lifestyle.		The 'Single House' would be located approximately 62m from the riding arena. It is considered that the use of a 'Single House' can be carried out alongside equestrian land uses compatibly. With regard to construction noise, it is noted that this can be perceived as a 'nuisance' however these works are temporary and should be capable of being undertaken without being to the detriment of the neighbours. Should Council however consider that the construction of the 'Single House' would adversely impact upon the equestrian activities of the neighbour and in turn rural residential amenity, it is suggested a condition could be imposed for a Construction Management Plan to be provided and possible measures for neighbour notification prior to specific noise generating activities.