

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 Support:	Officer Technical Comment:
Nil	Nil

Comments Received in Objection:	Officer Technical Comment:
<p><u>Building Height</u></p> <p>Concerns raised in regards to the building height not meeting the deemed to comply requirements of the City's Built Form Policy. The proposed departure is considered to impact on the character of the existing streetscape, which predominantly comprises of single level development. The proposed building height is considered to impact on the adjoining properties access to natural light and increase the overshadowing.</p>	<p>The proposal exceeds the deemed-to-comply height of 7.0 metres for a concealed roof by 0.2 metres but complied with the deemed-to-comply height of two-storey for the area. The proposed second storey addition is setback 10.63 metres from the street. This complies with the primary street setback requirement of 6 metres. In response to the submissions received during advertising, the applicant has amended the development plans to use a similar colour in the cladding and render which are considered to be similar to the materials of the existing dwelling. The existing dwelling and the façade are not proposed to be altered and therefore, the rear addition and the second storey are considered to be adequately screened from the primary street. It is considered that this reduces the perception of building bulk and maintains the existing character of the street.</p> <p>The subject site includes an existing 3.63 metre access leg located along the southern boundary of the property. The access leg is considered to provide adequate separation between the development and the adjoining property to the south. The southern façade also provides contrasting material and finishes to assist in mitigating the impact of bulk on the adjoining property. On the northern boundary, the subject shares a common boundary wall with the adjoining property. The length of the boundary wall varies in height, with a maximum height being 5.5 metres. The proposed second storey addition will protrude an additional 1.2 metres above the existing boundary wall, which is not considered to impact on the adjoining property. Given the context of the subject site, it is considered that the additional height is negligible and will not adversely impact on the adjoining landowners.</p> <p>The proposal complies with the overshadowing requirements the R-Codes and will allow for direct sun and ventilation to the buildings and open spaces on the subject site and the adjoining properties.</p> <p>It is considered that the height proposed satisfies the design principles and local housing objectives Clause 5.6 of the R-Codes and the City's Built Form Policy respectively.</p>

Summary of Submissions:

Comments Received in Objection:	Officer Technical Comment:
<p><u>Setbacks</u></p> <p>Concerns raised in regards to the building mass and bulk on the adjoining properties and increased impact of overlooking and overshadowing.</p>	<p>The development complies with the overshadowing requirements of Clause 5.4.2 of the Residential Design Codes (R Codes).</p>
<p><u>Streetscape</u></p> <p>Concerns raised on the impact of the proposed second storey on the streetscape and character of the area, which is predominantly single storey 'terrace style' dwellings. The proposed second storey is considered to be too visible from the street and surrounding properties. The proposed colours and materials are not considered to be consistent with the existing streetscape.</p>	<p>The subject site is permitted to develop with a two-storey building height under the City's Built Form Policy. As above, the proposed second storey addition is setback 10.2 metres from the street, which is considered to reduce the perception of building bulk to the street.</p>
<p><u>Visual Privacy</u></p> <p>Concerns relating to loss of privacy from the windows located on the proposed upper level.</p>	<p>The applicant has amended the development plans to fully comply with the requirements of the Visual Privacy requirements of Clause 5.4.1 C1.1 of the R Codes.</p>
<p><u>Land Use</u></p> <p>Concerns raised in regards to the intended use of the property as a rental or short-term dwelling.</p>	<p>The subject site has approval for residential use only. Development approval will be required to be obtained by the City and approved by Council should the subject site be intended to operate as a 'Short Term Dwelling' (Air BnB style of development).</p>
<p><u>Inaccurate Plans</u></p> <p>Concerns raised regarding the accuracy of the development plans and the misrepresentation of the existing rear garage structure.</p>	<p>The City has undertaken a site visit as part of the development assessment process and as a result has referred the existing outbuilding to the City's Compliance Team for investigation. This existing outbuilding does not form part of this application and will be considered by the City separately.</p>
<p><u>Pool</u></p> <p>Concerns raised regarding the location of the proposed spa area in relation to the adjoining properties outdoor living area.</p>	<p>The City's Policy No. 7.5.1 – Minor Nature Development exempts pool and decking structures that are not raised more than 500mm above from development approval. The proposed pool and deck are not raised greater than 500mm from the natural ground level and are therefore exempt. Given this, it is recommended that the proposed pool and deck not form part of the development approval.</p>

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