

Summary of Submissions:

The table below summarises the comments received during the initial advertising period of the proposal from 14 June 2017 to 28 June 2017, together with the City's response to each comment.

Comments Received in Objection:	Officer Technical Comment:
<p><u>Number of Dwellings</u></p> <p>Concern that the proposed number of seven dwellings is excessive for the locality.</p>	<p>The proposed density of the development being multiple dwellings is consistent with the R60 density coding which applies to the subject site and surrounding residential properties along Anderson Street.</p> <p>The plot ratio for the proposed development complies with the deemed-to-comply standards of the R-Codes. The proposed development is two storeys.</p>
<p><u>Car Parking</u></p> <p>Concern that the proposed seven resident car bays and two visitor bays will not be sufficient for the proposed seven dwellings, given that most 2-bedroom households have two cars. The lack of on-site car parking is likely to have an adverse impact on the surrounding properties, as residents and visitors will be forced to use on-street parking on Anderson Street which is already congested.</p>	<p>The development complies with the deemed-to-comply parking requirements of the State Government's R-Codes of seven resident and two visitor car bays. In order to ensure that the development doesn't contribute to parking congestion in the street, an advice note is included that advises the applicant and owner that the City of Vincent will not issue a residential or visitor car parking permit to any owner or occupier of the residential dwellings.</p>
<p><u>Lot Boundary Setbacks</u></p> <p>Concern that the reduced setbacks will impact the visual amenity of, and limit access to natural light to, the adjoining properties.</p>	<p>The development is well articulated with varying materials, colours and setbacks, which reduces the impacts of building bulk on the adjoining properties. As the subject lot is oriented north-to-south, the reduced first floor setbacks to the eastern and western boundaries will not have an overshadowing impact on the adjoining properties.</p>
<p><u>Building Height</u></p> <p>Concern that the increased building height will impact the adjoining properties' access to natural light.</p>	<p>The proposed building height is consistent with the other two storey developments on Anderson Street. Given the north-to-south orientation of the lot, the development will not have an overshadowing impact on the adjoining properties in accordance with the R-Codes.</p>
<p><u>Visual Privacy</u></p> <p>Concern that the balconies to Units 6 and 7 will allow for overlooking into the adjoining properties.</p>	<p>Following the community consultation period the City received amended plans that demonstrate that the balconies to Units 6 and 7 are screened in accordance with the Residential Design Codes.</p>

Summary of Submissions:

Comments Received in Objection:	Officer Technical Comment:
<p><u>External Fixtures</u></p> <p>Concern that the proposed location of external fixtures such as air-conditioning units will have adverse visual and noise impacts on the streetscape and adjoining properties.</p>	<p>The plans demonstrate that the air-conditioning units will be screened from view from the street and neighbouring properties. Noise from the air conditioning units will be required to comply with the State Government's <i>Environmental Protection (Noise) Regulations 1997</i>.</p>
<p><u>Landscaping</u></p> <p>Concern that the proposed landscaping canopy over the lot boundaries will impact the adjoining properties.</p>	<p>The City's Built Form Policy requires new developments to provide a minimum of 30% canopy cover at maturity, however the planning framework does not restrict the placement of trees along the perimeter of a site.</p>
<p><u>Street Walls and Fences</u></p> <p>Object to the increased wall height.</p>	<p>Following community consultation the City received amended plans that demonstrate that the front fence and letterbox meet the deemed-to-comply maximum wall heights.</p>

Note: Submissions are considered and assessed by issue rather than by individual submitter.

The table below summarises the comments received during the subsequent advertising period of the proposal from 12 October 2017 to 25 October 2017, together with the City's response to each comment.

Comments Received in Objection:	Officer Technical Comment:
<p><u>Density and Number of Dwellings</u></p> <p>Mount Hawthorn is zoned 40. A maximum of three dwellings per site is more suitable for Anderson Street.</p> <p>Concern that the proposed number of seven dwellings is excessive for the locality and is more suited to the neighbouring suburb of Glendalough, which is zoned R80.</p>	<p>The proposed density of the development being multiple dwellings is consistent with the R60 density coding which applies to the subject site and surrounding residential properties along Anderson Street.</p> <p>The plot ratio for the proposed development complies with the deemed-to-comply standards of the R-Codes. The proposed development is two storeys.</p>
<p><u>Street Setback</u></p> <p>Concern that the reduced street setback limits growth of trees.</p>	<p>The proposed street setback can accommodate significant landscaping, whilst still providing clear and separate vehicle and pedestrian access. The proposal provides for seven mature trees in the front setback area and proposed planting of two additional verge trees.</p>
<p><u>Traffic</u></p> <p>Concern that the proposed seven dwelling will increase traffic in the street, as Anderson Street is already used as a thoroughfare.</p>	<p>The development proposes a total of seven dwellings. Anderson Street has sufficient capacity to accommodate the additional traffic that will be created by these seven dwellings.</p>

Summary of Submissions:

Comments Received in Objection:	Officer Technical Comment:
<p><u>Car Parking</u></p> <p>Concern that the proposal for both visitor bays to be located at the front of the building does not comply with the City's design guideline that discourages car parking from being at the front of development, in order to avoid having cars parked visible from the street.</p> <p>Recent grouped and multiple dwelling developments on other properties on Anderson Street, which have one car bay per dwelling, has resulted in on-street parking being congested and cars regularly being parked on the verges and driveways of other properties. Request that the City line marks and sign posts the street to make it clear where cars can and can't park.</p> <p>Request that residents of the proposed development are not permitted to have parking permits.</p>	<p>On 16 January 2017 the City's Policy No. 7.1.1 - Built Form was published, which rescinded Policy No. 7.4.8 – Design Guidelines for Multiple Dwellings.</p> <p>With regards to location of visitor bays, the Design Guidelines for Multiple Dwellings (rescinded) included a provision that visitor bays should not be located in the front setback area. However, the Built Form Policy does not include any provision regarding the location of visitor bays.</p> <p>The significant landscaping that is provided in the front setback will assist in softening the visual impact of the cars parked at the front of the building.</p> <p>The development complies with the deemed-to-comply parking requirement of seven resident and two visitor car bays. In order to ensure that the development doesn't contribute to parking congestion in the street, an advice note is included that advises the applicant and owner that the City of Vincent will not issue a residential or visitor car parking permit to any owner or occupier of the residential dwellings.</p>
<p><u>Lot Boundary Setbacks</u></p> <p>Concern that the reduced setbacks of up to 50% of the deemed-to-comply requirements will impact the amenity and access to natural light of the outdoor areas of the adjoining properties.</p> <p>Concern that reduced lot boundary setbacks do not provide adequate fire separation to the adjoining properties.</p>	<p>The development is well articulated with varying materials, colours and setbacks, which reduces the impacts of building bulk on the adjoining properties. As the subject lot is oriented north-to-south, the reduced first floor setbacks to the eastern and western boundaries will not have an overshadowing impact on the adjoining properties.</p> <p>The development will be required to comply with Building Codes of Australia fire separation provisions.</p>
<p><u>Boundary Walls</u></p> <p>Concern that proposal to build up to three lot boundaries in lieu of the deemed-to-comply two boundaries is indicative of excessive development of the site and/or the development is poorly designed.</p>	<p>The bulk of the development is broken up by the front and rear buildings being separated by 17.7 metres, where the central open-air car parking is located.</p> <p>The lengths of the western and eastern boundary walls represent a small portion of the lot boundaries and are well under the deemed-to-comply maximum lengths. The western boundary wall has a total length of 6.4 metres, in lieu of the maximum length of 24.5 metres set as a deemed-to-comply standard in the R-Codes. The western boundary wall is to a bin store and store room. The eastern boundary walls have a total length of 12.5 metres, in lieu of the maximum length of 24.5 metres set as a deemed-to-comply standard in the R-Codes.</p>

Summary of Submissions:

Comments Received in Objection:	Officer Technical Comment:
<p>Concern that the development being built up to the lot boundaries will result in there being a noise impact on the adjoining properties when the dwellings are occupied.</p>	<p>The eastern and western boundary walls are to store rooms and bin stores and the northern boundary walls are to bedrooms of units 4 and 5. It is not considered that the development being built up to three lot boundaries will create any greater noise impacts on the adjoining properties compared to a wall setback in accordance with the deemed-to-comply standards of the R-Codes.</p>
<p><u>Building Height</u></p> <p>Concern that the increased height of the development will dominate the streetscape and will impact the adjoining properties' access to natural light.</p>	<p>Due the north-to-south orientation of the lot, the development will not have an overshadowing impact on the adjoining properties in accordance with the R-Codes. The development is setback from the western, northern and eastern lot boundaries, which provides adequate space for natural light and ventilation to the major opening windows of the adjoining properties.</p> <p>The proposed building height is consistent with the other two storey developments on Anderson Street and will be complimentary to the emerging streetscape of newer grouped and multiple dwelling developments. The development incorporates varying colours and materials into the façade, which draws on interpretation of materials found within the local area and reduces the perception of height.</p> <p>and reduces the perception of height.</p>
<p><u>Visual Privacy</u></p> <p>Concern that the development impacts visual privacy of the front and rear open spaces of the adjoining properties. Request that the balconies be screened.</p>	<p>Following the community consultation period the City received amended plans that demonstrate that the balconies to Units 6 and 7 are screened in accordance with the Residential Design Codes.</p> <p>The area of land overlooked from unit 2 is a blank parapet wall, away from active habitable spaces, outdoor living areas and building openings.</p> <p>The area of land impacted on the eastern adjoining property is a blank wall to a portion of building which accommodates an air-conditioning unit, away from outdoor living areas and building openings.</p>
<p><u>Construction Management</u></p> <p>Other developments on Anderson Street have had significant impacts on adjoining properties during construction stages, with many years of excessive and unreasonable radio noise, dirt, abuse, threatening behaviour, foul language, being disturbed before 7:00am on Sundays and public holidays, damage cars and property, and costs incurred to repair damage and for construction-related cleaning.</p>	<p>The applicant will be required to submit and obtain approval for a construction management plan prior the issue of a Building Permit.</p>

Summary of Submissions:

Comments Received in Objection:	Officer Technical Comment:
<p>Request that the City ensures traffic management and parking restrictions are enforced during construction of the proposed development and that the street is monitored to ensure construction workers don't commence work on-site prior to 7:00am.</p>	<p>The applicant will be required to submit and obtain approval for a construction management plan, including traffic management, prior the issue of a Building Permit. In the event that any traffic or parking issues during construction are referred to the City, the relevant compliance processes will be undertaken by the City to ensure compliance is achieved and disruption to neighbours is addressed.</p>
<p><u>Developer Contributions</u></p> <p>Similar to the 1% for public art on larger developments, I'd like to see the Council introduce a requirement for developers to provide \$500 compensation to adjacent property residents to offset damage and cleaning costs.</p>	<p>The planning framework does not provide the option for the City to obtain any contributions for compensation to neighbouring properties for damage or cleaning costs. In the event that any damage or cleaning issues during construction are referred to the City, the relevant compliance processes will be undertaken by the City to ensure compliance is achieved and disruption to neighbours is addressed.</p>
<p><u>External Fixtures</u></p> <p>With reference to Clause 6.4.5, C5.3 of the Residential Design Codes, the proposed gas and electric meter boxes are not adequately integrated with the building and are clearly visible from the street and adjoining development. It is also unclear from the plans as to whether the proposed electric meter boxes are to be mounted on the dwelling's garage wall in Communities' ownership.</p> <p>The amended development plans do not include details of location of external fixtures such as air-conditioning units, which should be located and screened to mitigate any visual or acoustic impacts on adjoining properties.</p>	<p>Following community consultation the City received amended plans that demonstrate that the meter boxes will be located behind the front setback and will be situated against the 1.8 metre high dividing fence along the western boundary, perpendicular to the street.</p> <p>Following community consultation the City received amended plans that demonstrate that all air-conditioning units are screened from view from the street and adjoining properties. Noise from the air conditioning units will be required to comply with the State Government's <i>Environmental Protection (Noise) Regulations 1997</i>.</p>
<p><u>Utilities and Facilities</u></p> <p>With reference to Clause 6.4.6, C6.3, it is common for residents to use upper floor balconies as outdoor clothes-drying areas which will be visible from the primary street if the balustrade is fully glass/permeable. It is recommended that a small section of the balcony balustrade is of a solid or non-permeable in nature to address this common issue.</p>	<p>In order to address the concerns regarding the visual impact of clothes drying areas on the street, it is recommended that a condition be imposed on any approval requiring the provision of a clothes drying area for each of the front units which is screened from view from Anderson Street.</p>

Summary of Submissions:

Comments Received in Objection:	Officer Technical Comment:
<p><u>Consultation</u></p> <p>What is the purpose of doing community consultation when the City doesn't listen to the community's concerns and has already decided to approve the development?</p>	<p>All comments received during community consultation are considered in detail as part of the City's assessment of development proposals. Following receipt of submissions during the community consultation period, a summary of the comments raised is provided to the applicant, who is requested to amend their plans to address the comments raised. In the case of this application, the applicant made substantial changes as a result of community consultation. These were so substantial to warrant further community consultation on the revised plans. Following community consultation and the applicant's response and the City undertakes a detailed assessment of the proposal against the legal planning framework, having regard to all of the comments raised during community consultation and the applicant's response. The City then makes a recommendation to Council on whether the development meets the legal planning framework or not, including any conditions which may be required to address areas of non-compliance.</p>

Note: Submissions are considered and assessed by issue rather than by individual submitter.