



17th September 2025

TOWN OF VICTORIA PARK Received: 25/09/2025

Planning Department Town of Victoria Park' 99 Shepperton Road Victoria Park WA 6100

Property Address: 104 Jarrah Road, East Victoria Park

development approval for its removal

under LPP47.

Proposal: Rear extension and new carport to existing residence

Council Reference: NA

Dear Sir/ Madam,

I write to you on behalf of my client and owners of 104 Jarrah Road, East Victoria Park regarding a proposal and planning application being lodged for the address. Previous correspondence with Rachel Neve determined that there were some deviations from the residential codes and local planning policies that required amendment or justifications. We have addressed three of the four deviations outlined in the below table:

Non-compliant aspect	Van Der Haus response/ amendment	
 Carport posts – The proposed development is non-compliant with Local Planning Policy 25 – Streetscape Clause 2 A2 (c) ii, as the carport columns are not setback from the side boundary to provide an eave overhang of a consistent width with the dwelling. It is noted that cranked carport posts are generally not supported. 	The Drawings have been amended to situate the carport per the Local planning policy	
• Street walls and fences - The proposed development is non-compliant with Local Planning Policy 25 – Streetscape Clause 6 Al.3 (a), as a maximum width and depth dimension of piers are not to exceed 460mm x 460mm, whilst the proposed letterbox pier is 500mm x 500mm.	The drawings have been amended to reduce the letterbox pillar size and to show an example of the fencing proposed by way of image	
• Regulated tree – The tree located at the rear of the property appears to fit the definition of a regulated tree under the Council's Local Planning Policy No. 47 – Tree Retention (LPP47). The submitted site survey and site plan shows a 5 metre high bottlebrush. However, the Town has utilised satelite imaging which calculated the height of this tree as greater than 8 metres, which means that it will require	This tree has been resurveyed and is well below the nominated regulated tree size. Please refer to the report accompanying this application	





The last non-compliance to be addressed relates to the following:

TOWN OF VICTORIA PARK Received: 25/09/2025

Boundary wall – The proposed development is non-compliant with R-Codes Clause 5.1.3 C3.2 as the maximum length of boundary wall permitted is 12.4m (being one-third the length of the site boundary), whilst 18.1m length is proposed. The maximum height of the boundary wall permitted is 3.5m, whilst 3.6m is proposed.

We understand that whilst generally supportable, deviation from the Local Planning Policy requires justification in order to obtain planning approval for the proposed works at the address.

The main dispensation sought refer to the following:

5.1.3 Boundary walls

1. Wall to East boundary

Proposed:

The proposed wall to the rear is 18.066m long with Nil Setback from the East Boundary

The dispensation we seek is for the length of this wall along the Eastern boundary which is 18.066m In lieu of 12.24m. Aside from the proposal being located to optimise solar access to the dwelling, t is worth noting that a sewer easement to the North deems the boundary to this side challenging to build upon.

The design principles are listed below along justification to achieve compliance.

Required	Proposed
P3.1	
Buildings set back from lot boundaries or adjacent buildings on the same lot so as to:	
reduce impacts of building bulk on adjoining properties;	The bulk of the building is addressed through the stepping down of the rear addition so that bulk is kept to a minimum for the East side
 provide adequate sunlight and ventilation to the building and open spaces on the site and adjoining properties; 	The design is predominantly orientated to take advantage of the northern sun
 minimise the extent of overlooking and resultant loss of privacy on adjoining properties. 	The wall along the East improves privacy amenity to the neighbouring property and is not susceptible to any overlooking as there are no openings orientated to this boundary



www.vanderhaus.com.au



Req	uired	Proposed
P3.2		TOWN OF VICTORIA PARK Received: 25/09/2025
	dings built up to boundaries (other than the et boundary) where this:	
•	makes more effective use of space for enhanced privacy for the occupant/s or outdoor living areas;	The purpose of the design is to bring the living space to the lower level for better indoor to outdoor amenity
•	does not compromise the design principle contained in clause 5.1.3 P3.1; does not have any adverse impact on the amenity of the adjoining property;	Please see justification for this clause above
• and	ensures sunlight to major openings to habitable rooms and outdoor living areas for adjoining properties is not restricted;	The proposed addition has minimal impact on the adjoining property. An overshadowing diagram has been supplied to show overshadowing to the adjoining property
•	positively contributes to the prevailing or future development context and streetscape as outlined in the local planning framework	The proposed works are focused to the rear and do not detract from the streetscape

A set of drawings have been submitted indicating the proposed scope and extent of the addition.

We believe that the proposed design provides benefits for the occupants due to improved overall usability and access to a highly used and usable outdoor living space and provides added privacy for neighbours to the East.

I trust this meets council's requirements and I look forward to discussing further and supplying any additional information required to obtain the delegated authorities approval. Should you have any queries or wish to discuss, please contact me on the details provided above.

Sincerely,



Residential Designer