

Summary of Submissions:

The tables below summarise the comments received during the advertising period of the proposal, together with the City's response to each comment.

Comments Received in Concern:	Officer Technical Comment:
<p><u>Visual Privacy</u></p> <p>We were relatively happy with the development, but had some concerns regarding the upstairs windows as they would look directly into our backyard and home. Is there anything that could be done about this, such as opaque windows?</p>	<p>Noted. All proposed openings into habitable rooms are compliant with Clause 5.4.1 Visual Privacy deemed-to-comply criteria of the Residential Design Codes. As such, the windows and balcony on the first floor are considered acceptable.</p>
<p>Comments Received in Objection:</p> <p><u>Street Setback</u></p> <p>A 6 metres setback from the street is a ridiculous impediment to urban infill. Let them build up to the boundary and use the most of our scarce land.</p> <p>Changes needed – propose a setback of less than 1m from boundary (the same setback as 67 Bourke Street's setback on Scott Street) or if the setback is kept greater than 1m then the removal of the balcony from the Western face.</p>	<p>Noted. The applicant seeks a street setback of 6.026 metres in lieu 7.9 metres. The proposed setback is consistent with the existing streetscape and the incorporation of landscaping within the front setback will assist in moderating any impact of building bulk. The proposed street setback is consistent with the relevant design principles of Clause 5.2 Street Setback of the Built Form Policy and is considered acceptable.</p>
<p><u>Lot Boundary Setback</u> <i>Northern Wall</i></p> <p>We want space between our house and theirs to promote good neighbourly distance and privacy Changes needed – retain setback on northern boundary of 2.8m. Compensate by reducing setback to Scott street to less than 1m.</p>	<p>Noted. Following the community consultation period, the applicant submitted amended plans that propose a setback which satisfies the deemed-to-comply criteria of Clause 5.1.3 Lot Boundary Setbacks of the Residential Design Codes.</p>
<p><u>Lot Boundary Wall</u></p> <p>Build the garage all the way up to the street. There is so much wasted space in the front yard, why not use it for a garage.</p> <p>Changes needed – reduce setback on Scott Street to less than 1 metre.</p>	<p>Noted. The proposed garage and boundary wall location is adjacent to a brick outbuilding (garage) wall on the adjacent northern property. The setback of the proposed garage is considered appropriate in this location.</p>

Summary of Submissions:

Comments Received in Objection:	Officer Technical Comment:
<p><u>Visual Privacy</u></p> <p>There are at least 4 places on the first floor of this development that look directly into the northern lot. Even though the balcony has a wall on the northern side, with a setback of 6m from the street, the wall offers little protection into the northern adjoining lot. With this setback there is a clear line of sight from anyone sitting on the balcony to the backyards of the northern adjoining lots.</p> <p>There are 19 courses from the floor level (31 courses) to the three windows which overlook our backyard (55 courses). According to Midland Brick coursing table 19 courses is 1.62 metres. According the Australian Bureau of Statistics the average man is 1.75 metres and the average woman is 1.61 metres. The average person will be able to see out this window. Yes there are shorter people in the world, they will see out this window when changing a light globe, cleaning blinds or just standing on their toes or on a chair to enjoy a sunset. It is worth noting that this is a family house with a young child who in a few short years will be very curious as children are.</p> <p>Changes needed – Frosted windows (as are in No. 63 Bourke overlooking No. 65 Bourke). A great benefit of this is energy reduction; this house is currently designed without any consideration for shading the western and northern summer sun. It'll be baking hot in there and will need air conditioning spring to autumn. All windows on the northern face will soak up the summer sun completely.</p>	<p>The proposed windows and balcony along the northern walls satisfy the deemed-to-comply criteria of Clause 5.4.1 Visual Privacy of the Residential Design Codes.</p> <p>The proposed windows along the northern walls are compliant with the deemed-to-comply criteria of Clause 5.4.1 Visual Privacy of the Residential Design Codes.</p>
<p><u>Location of Balcony</u></p> <p>Sitting on the balcony will provide a view into 40 percent of our backyard. Changes needed – I support the smallest setback possible from the street.</p>	<p>The proposed balcony is compliant with the deemed-to-comply criteria of Clause 5.4.1 Visual Privacy of the Residential Design Codes.</p>
<p><u>Landscaping</u></p> <p>3 percent canopy coverage is an example of poor design. Vincent and the local birdlife need the continued existence of established tree canopy.</p> <p>Changes needed – Enforce 30% canopy rule. There are numerous established trees in the back yard and front yard that do not need to be knocked down for this development to happen.</p> <p>Strongly object.</p>	<p>Noted. Following the community consultation period, the applicant submitted amended plans which increased the landscaping to provide canopy coverage of 13.7 per cent. The proposed landscaping is greater than the existing canopy coverage on the subject site, and is located in a position which will reduce the impact of the building bulk of a standard two-storey development on the locality. The proposed landscaping is consistent with the relevant design principles of Clause 5.14 of the Built Form Policy.</p>

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