



Submission; Neither support or object.

We neither support or object but would like for some concerns to be addressed.

In the past 2 years we have had numerous building projects happening on Milton Street and close by on Jugan Street some occurring at the same time. The builders and contractors are not particularly considerate of local residents when parking and given no 48 is in close proximity to Brady Street we are concerned with how local resident traffic will cope and be impacted.

the builder has ample experience with constructing similar developments. With the width of the lot there is ample space on the road for tradesmen to park in front of the lot. There will also be area for parking along the common driveway while under construction. The builder will keep an eye on all their trades to ensure that the local residents do not get impacted negatively.

Submission; Object

The proposed development sticks out >3m from the eastern adjoining property, and >1m from the western.

It represents an unacceptable erosion of the average setback used to determine future developments. Especially if the neighbouring corner property was to be developed it will be a dangerous precedent, and will create a wall of concrete right up to the road, and harm the character and amenity of the street. There has already been numerous car accidents at this corner, and one serious accident resulted in a car driving through the wall of the corner property 46 Milton Street. Street setbacks are not just to protect the character and appeal of the street but also to protect against car collisions into houses. I would be satisfied with a 3 metre set-back to be in line with the neighbouring property.

The proposed front setback is compliant with the R60 requirements and consistent with other new developments in the street.

We believe it isn't appropriate to assume what the neighbour may or may not build in the future.

It is also unreasonable to assume that our development will potentially cause car accidents



As advised the 15% landscaping restriction is a council approved condition. It would be unacceptable to allow the reduced landscaping ratio considering this is council requirement.

The landscaping helps in keeping the street from looking like a “concrete jungle”. I do believe with some careful modifications the minimum landscaping ratio could be achieved. Please note the addition of grass down the centre of the driveway to achieve this ratio, does not work. This is evidenced by the development at 51 Milton Street, where they ended up replacing it as brick paving.

I do hope and anticipate the council will enforce the outcome of the landscaping condition on this plan. It has been noted several developments surrounding included landscaping but once built this never eventuated. You will note 52 Milton Street is a concrete eyesore development with little to no landscaping within the complex.

The front setback has sufficient landscaping proposed. Also as this site has 2 mature verge trees the bulk of the buildings will be softened considerable. Based on this it is unreasonable to say that this development would contribute to a “concrete jungle”. With the use of planter boxes in the front setback area the landscaping provided will be to a high standard.

The alfresco area for the adjoining property 50C Milton Street and an outdoor side section of 50B Milton Street backs onto the 3.6m wall proposed on the Western boundary. The building wall will eliminate any direct sunlight and cause great overshadowing in the alfresco area.

Additionally, the proposed white walls will reflect into the alfresco area in the afternoons, causing the alfresco area to be unusable in the afternoons. As per the codes outdoor living areas are to provide space “capable of use in conjunction with a habitable room of the dwelling” This will not be able to be achieved.

The wall will cause a huge impact to the living to residents residing in 50C Milton and 50B Milton.

The proposed boundary wall to the west is not adjacent to any outdoor living areas.



The adjoining outdoor living areas are all adjacent to the common driveway and therefore the proposed development will have no negative impact on the adjoining courtyards. this is a fantastic outcome for the adjoining outdoor areas.

To suggest that the outdoor areas will not be usable in the afternoons due to reflections on our walls has no substance. Not all of these walls are white.

The code specifies a minimum requirement for outdoor living, and this is based on the R60 code. NO units within this proposed development adhere to this requirement. Outdoor living must be able to provide ventilation, sunlight and further living space.

The proposed developers have tried to achieve maximum building area while foregoing one of the most important aspects within high density living. This is unacceptable. Having reviewed the plans, I believe it could also be easily fixed if the plans are slightly changed, and indoor building area is slightly reduced. The codes are there are for a reason. If the codes are not adhered to, I do not understand how this can criteria could be approved.

each of the proposed outdoor areas meet the minimum area requirements of the r-codes.